

that from now on Western Australia will become the best State educationally—primary, secondary, and tertiary.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. F. Cloughton.

EASTERN GOLDFIELDS TRANSPORT BOARD ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 13th October.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) [8.57 p.m.]: The Bill before us is for an Act to amend the Eastern Goldfields Transport Board Act, 1946-1970. It is only a small measure—in fact, it could be termed a mini, because it is long enough to cover the subject and short enough to be effective.

As the Minister said, the Bill is to alter the constitution of the board in order that it can be reorganised because of the alterations to the local authorities in that area. In that respect it is a machinery measure.

Members might recall that on the goldfields there was the Shire of Kalgoorlie, the Town of Boulder, and the Town of Kalgoorlie. The Town of Boulder and the Shire of Kalgoorlie ceased to exist, leaving the Kalgoorlie Town Council and the Boulder Shire Council. It is necessary to appoint two representatives from the local authorities to be members of the Eastern Goldfields Transport Board, and also one member from each local authority to represent the ratepayers. There will be a Government nominee appointed by the Governor, and he will be the chairman. Each local authority will submit a nominee to the Government as its choice for chairman. Of these the Government will choose one, and he will be the chairman.

It is interesting to note that this is the first time the board has shown a profit on its undertakings. This is because of a greater number of passengers carried. There is a service to Coolgardie and the board runs a school bus service to and from Kambalda as well as a passenger service. There is also a service to Scotia, and these are in addition to the services which are operated around the town.

The upsurge of mining in the goldfields is reflected in the Eastern Goldfields Transport Board's operations. I have no desire to prolong the debate on the subject. I am therefore pleased to support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [9.01 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 20th October.
Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.02 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 14th October, 1970

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Guthrie) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (41): ON NOTICE

1. TOWN PLANNING

Badgingarra Townsite

Mr. **TOMS**, to the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) When were plans for the townsite at Badgingarra approved by the Town Planning Department?
- (2) What progress has been made with the scheme up to the present time?
- (3) When can the local authority and interested parties expect action for the building of same, and the fulfilment of the scheme?

Mr. **LEWIS** replied:

- (1) September, 1969.
- (2) and (3) Negotiations are current with the shire, the Lands Department, and the Town Planning Department.

2. POLICE

Housing: Kalgoorlie

Mr. **T. D. EVANS**, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he in receipt of a letter from the police union of workers relative to the serious housing shortage facing police officers stationed at Kalgoorlie?
- (2) When, and what action will be taken to rectify the position?

Sir **DAVID BRAND** replied:

- (1) Yes, on the 9th October, 1970.
- (2) The matter is under consideration.

3. LAND

Building Blocks: Sale at Kununurra

Mr. **RIDGE**, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) When is it proposed to conduct the next housing land sale at Kununurra?

- (2) Will he take steps to have any unsold properties made available for purchase on an over-the-counter basis at the upset price?
- (3) If "No" why not?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) A sale of 35 residential sites was held at Kununurra on the 27th May last, at which eight lots only were sold. Most of the lots passed in were subsequently disposed of to the State Housing Commission, Medical Department, and Department of Native Welfare.

Arrangements for a further auction sale, which will be held at an early date, are nearing finality.

- (2) and (3) Any lots passed in at the forthcoming sale will be available for direct disposal under the provisions of section 41A of the Land Act.

4. EDUCATION

Pastoral Industry Training School: Kimberleys

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) In the matter of training young men for eventual employment in the pastoral industry, could he advise if consideration has ever been given to the prospect of creating a pastoral industry training school at either the Kimberley or West Kimberley Research Station?
- (2) If such a proposal has been considered and found to be impracticable, will he indicate why?
- (3) If he has not, will he cause to have the suggestion thoroughly investigated?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) The Kimberley and West Kimberley Research Stations are under the control of the Department of Agriculture. The Education Department has no plans to establish a training school.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Yes.

5. *This question was postponed until Tuesday, the 20th October.*

6. BRIDGE

Fitzroy Crossing

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Main Roads Department any firm plans for the provision of a high level bridge over the Fitzroy River in the vicinity of Fitzroy Crossing?

- (2) If "Yes" will he provide details as to the locality of the proposed structure and indicate when it is hoped to commence construction?
- (3) If "No" what long-range plans does the department have in relation to the matter?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Several sites are being evaluated and no decision has yet been made regarding the exact location of the proposed structure. The department's financial planning provides that work on this bridge will commence during 1972.
- (3) Answered by (2).

7. JUVENILE OFFENDERS

Traffic Act: Notification of Parents

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is there provision for parents to be notified of juvenile prosecutions under the Traffic Act?
- (2) If not, is there any reason why this should not be required particularly in cases where parents and juvenile (for whom parents are responsible) live at different addresses—possibly one in the country?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. Craig), replied:

- (1) Yes, where an arrest is made the police are required to notify the parents and the Child Welfare Department.
There is no provision for notification of parents where a notice is issued to a juvenile that he is required to attend the Children's Court, although the notice includes the advice "your father or mother or some responsible adult relative should accompany you."
- (2) Further investigations will be made on the point raised by the honourable member.

8. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Two Rocks, Yanchep

Mr. TONKIN, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Will the supply of electricity to a caravan park on Two Rocks enable it to be extended to a subdivision on Two Rocks?
- (2) What is the basis of the sharing of costs by the State Electricity Commission and Taylor Woodrow Bond Pty. Ltd. in connection with the extension to the caravan park?
- (3) What criteria give an extension to the caravan park at Two Rocks a higher priority than Myalup?
- (4) When was this new policy of sharing costs first adopted?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Not necessarily. Further extensions may be considered after the extension to the caravan park has been completed.
- (2) (a) The cost of the proposed extension from the Two Rocks road to the caravan site has been paid for by Taylor Woodrow Bond Pty. Ltd.
- (b) Depending on the development completed at the time the connection is required, the extension from existing mains to the boundary of the site will either be a normal justifiable extension or Taylor Woodrow Bond Pty. Ltd. will be required to enter into a contributory extension scheme agreement.
- (3) No priorities. Both extensions will proceed as soon as possible after the applicants concerned have complied with the requirements of their respective proposals.
- (4) The contributory extension scheme commenced in 1959 and a capital contribution was made a condition of all such extensions in 1966.

9. *This question was postponed.*

10. RAILWAY SLEEPERS

Imports

Mr. H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) What number of railway sleepers were imported into Western Australia during the last 18 months?
- (2) What was the total value of such importations?
- (3) From what source were these railway sleepers obtained?
- (4) What number of railway sleepers is it expected will be imported in the next 12 months?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Nil that I know of.
- (2) and (3) See answer to (1).
- (4) 130,000. These sleepers are for the Paraburdoo extension of the Hamersley Iron railway and are being imported from Malaysia. A contract for a further 290,000 Western Australian sleepers for this project has been awarded to Bunning Bros. Pty. Ltd.

11. HOSPITAL

Denmark

Mr. H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has financial provision been made in the current year's spending by his department for the previously

announced improvements to the Denmark Hospital to proceed in the 1970-71 year?

- (2) If not, will he indicate the full position regarding the future of this hospital?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes—planning is proceeding in order to provide for the Denmark Hospital improvements, but it is not necessary to provide staff accommodation as previously envisaged. It is expected that the new building will be on site early in 1971.
- (2) Not applicable.

12.

EDUCATION

School Canteens: Subsidy

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Education:

Should an order be placed in 1970 to build a school canteen, would this disqualify the parents and citizens' association who have placed the order from receiving the new subsidy as outlined in the Premier's Budget speech to grant a subsidy on a dollar for dollar basis?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

A building project completed after the 1st January, 1971, will qualify for the new subsidy payment.

13.

RAILWAYS DEPARTMENT

Proposed Accommodation

Mr. MAY, to the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is a new administrative building proposed for the Western Australian Government Railways?
- (2) Where will the building be located?
- (3) When will construction be completed?
- (4) What branches of the Railways Department will be accommodated in the new building?
- (5) What is the estimated cost of the proposed building?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Within the railway reserve in close proximity to the new terminal building on the western side.
- (3) Construction is dependent on funds but the proposal contemplates completion by the end of 1973.
- (4) All branches of the department will be accommodated in the new building.

- (5) Architects are at present compiling an estimated cost but indicative cost of the building is \$3,900,000.

14. **SURFBOARDS**
Safety Measures

Mr. BURKE, to the Premier:

Further to my question 11 of the 7th May, 1970, regarding the manufacture and design of surfboards, will he please advise the Government's decision?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

The Government has accepted recommendations from the Executive Committee of the Water Safety Division to the effect that—

- (a) no legislation is required at the present time;
- (b) educational publicity will be given to the need for accident prevention in aquatic sports with particular attention to the type and use of surfboards.

15. **RAILWAY PROPERTY**

Central City Area: Disposal

Mr. BURKE, to the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Has the Treasury approval been given for the disposal of any Western Australian Government Railways property in the central city area?
- (2) If "Yes" what is the location of the property involved, and what was the official valuation?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).

16 and 17. *These questions were postponed.*

18. **DELINQUENT CHILDREN**

Institutions: Expenditure

Mr. BURKE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

- (1) Would he indicate the total expenditure on institutions for delinquent children in the last five years?
- (2) Would he list the institutions and the total expenditure on each?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) \$2,981,179.
- (2) Riverbank—\$884,807.
Hillston—\$869,384.
Longmore—\$1,155,074.
Nyandi—\$71,914.

19. **HOUSING**

High Density Rental Accommodation

Mr. BURKE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) (a) Do persons who accept rental accommodation of high density type retain their right to single-house rental accommodation when their turn is reached;
- (b) if not, are these applicants advised of this fact on accepting the allocation of a flat?
- (2) Are applicants for rental accommodation advised that to decline flat accommodation does not affect their right to medium density, terrace, duplex, and single-house accommodation when their turn is reached?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) No. The acceptance of high rise or medium density accommodation is deemed to be satisfaction of the application for rental accommodation.
- (2) No. However, if an applicant, upon declining the offer of a flat, requests that his application remain listed for terrace, duplex and/or single house accommodation, then this is done.

20. **EMPLOYMENT BROKERS ACT**

Amending Legislation

Mr. BURKE, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Will he assure the House that amendments to the Employment Brokers Act will be introduced in the current session?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) Submissions made by the Employment Agents Association and others are still being considered. I am, therefore, unable to give the assurance requested.

21. *This question was postponed.*

22. **VEHICLE INSPECTIONS**

Merredin

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) What is the estimated cost of the proposed buildings for Merredin in which the police will carry out their vehicle examination and other licensing work?
- (2) What are the estimated salaries that will have to be paid to the extra two policemen and the vehicle examiner to be stationed at Merredin?

- (3) What equipment will be needed to police traffic and examine vehicles at Merredin?
- (4) What will be the cost of this equipment?
- (5) Are the personnel costs and equipment costs expected to escalate year by year (apart from ordinary wage and margin increase)?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. Craig) replied:

- (1) The proposal to erect such a building at Merredin has been deferred and no estimated cost has been arrived at.
- (2) A final decision concerning the staffing of the Merredin station has not yet been made, but on the basis suggested by the honourable member, the estimated cost would be \$11,500 for the first year.
- (3) A radio equipped patrol car, a headlight tester, brake meter, jacks, amphotometer, lighting plant, signs, and sundry tools.
- (4) \$4,000.
- (5) No. After the first year, costs should reduce.

23. PUBLIC HOLIDAY

Boxing Day

Mr. DAVIES, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Will Boxing Day, the 26th December, 1970, be a gazetted public holiday?
- (2) If so, will those who do not normally work on a Saturday be granted a day in lieu?
- (3) Will any different circumstances apply to Public Works Department "day labour" employees?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Boxing Day is a nominated public holiday under awards of the W.A. Industrial Commission and under the Factories and Shops Act, 1963. It is, therefore, not necessary to gazette the holiday.
- (2) No. When Boxing Day falls on a Saturday, it is observed on that day in accordance with the awards and the Act.
- (3) No.

24. ROAD TRANSPORT

Perth-Albany

Mr. COOK, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it correct that an overnight road transport service between Perth and Albany is to be operated by Mayne Nickless?
- (2) If so, what goods will be transported?

- (3) What is the anticipated effect, both in freights handled and revenue, that this move will have on railway operations?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The Transport Commission has received no application and has no knowledge of any proposal for such a service.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

25. STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

Operations South of Fremantle

Mr. COOK, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has a study been made into the feasibility of operating State ships from Fremantle to southern ports and return?
- (2) If so, on what date did the study commence and conclude?
- (3) Would he table the results of the study?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) A feasibility study, as such, has not been made. Inquiries as to the possibility of State Shipping Service vessels servicing south coast ports have been considered but have been rejected on economic grounds.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

26. SEWERAGE

Albany

Mr. COOK, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What is the total amount to be spent on sewerage works in Albany during 1970-71?
- (2) Would he detail the areas concerned and the nature of work to be undertaken in each area?
- (3) Would he detail the amount to be spent in each area?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) \$125,000.
- (2) (a) Reticulation of a part of the area bounded by Angove, Colingwood, and Cockburn Roads, and Park Street.
- (b) Route discharge from Cockburn Street pumping station to Middleton Beach pumping station. Work includes provision of a pumping main and a main gravity sewer via Middleton Road.
- (c) Minor sewer extensions within the sewered area.
- (d) Purchase of land for waste water treatment works to serve the North Lockyer area, and further investigations.

- (3) (a) \$35,000.
- (b) \$60,000.
- (c) \$15,000.
- (d) \$15,000.

27. ABATTOIRS

Hygiene: United States Requirements

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In what specific items do abattoirs in this State, or operations in such abattoirs, fail to measure up to the requirements of the United States of America?
- (2) If meat from such abattoirs does not reach the standards of hygiene deemed desirable or necessary for consumers in the United States of America, how is it that a lesser standard is deemed acceptable here?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The specific items are not known as the abattoirs referred to come under the control of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry and are at present the subject of investigation by that Department in conjunction with officers of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- (2) State meat inspectors at export works operate to the same standards as the Commonwealth meat inspectors and for this purpose are under the control of the Commonwealth veterinary officer in charge of each works. Consequently there is only one standard of inspection and that is the one laid down by the Department of Primary Industry.

28. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Units: Price

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What was—
 - (a) the estimated average savings per consumer resulting from recent reductions in tariff to country domestic consumers;
 - (b) the estimated total savings for country consumers?
- (2) (a) What percentage difference exists between the price paid per unit for electricity by an average domestic consumer in 1959 and 1970;
- (b) Is he able to compare this with the average weekly wage of a male person during the same period?
- (3) What were the sales of units of electricity by the commission in 1959 and 1970?

- (4) Since 1959, on how many occasions have there been reductions in rates of electricity to consumers, and what was the effect of those reductions?
- (5) Can an estimate be given of the effect of those savings to the consumer at the present rate of output?
- (6) What percentage of the total Collie coalfields output is purchased by the commission?
- (7) Approximately how many units of domestic power would the average weekly earnings of a male purchase in—
 - (a) 1959;
 - (b) 1970?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) (a) \$12 per year.
- (b) \$600,000 per year.
- (2) (a) Calculated on metropolitan consumers 13.3 per cent. reduction.
- (b) The average weekly earnings per employed male unit in Western Australia increased by 104.6 per cent.
- (3) 1959—547,228,000 kWh.
- 1970—1,854,602,800 kWh.
- (4) Three reductions to metropolitan and country consumers.
- The 1st March, 1961. Savings to consumers—\$700,000 per year.
- The 1st October, 1963. Savings to consumers—\$600,000 per year.
- The 14th February, 1966. Savings to consumers—\$154,000 per year.
- Introduction of country domestic tariff, the 1st September, 1970.
- Savings to consumers—\$600,000 per year.
- (5) Saving of approximately \$4,000,000 per year.
- (6) At present rate of ordering 96.5 per cent.
- (7) Calculated on metropolitan consumers—
 - (a) 1,654.
 - (b) 3,938.

29.

WHEAT Quotas

Mr. YOUNG, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What cognisance has been taken of hail claims in the assessment of 1970-71 wheat quotas in respect of—
 - (a) over-quota wheat from 1969-70 season;
 - (b) short-fall wheat from 1969-70 season?
- (2) When and for what reasons were these decisions arrived at?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Up to this point of time all insurance claims in the 1969-70 season shown by growers on their 1970-71 applications have been included as deliveries.

(a) over quota wheat has been affected accordingly.

(b) shortfall has been affected accordingly.

(2) The original guide lines for the Wheat Quota Committee when it was first appointed on the 21st May, 1969, instructed that all substantiated insurance claims should be regarded as deliveries when arriving at base quotas for respective properties for the 1969-70 season.

At a meeting of the Wheat Industry Advisory Committee on the 19th January, 1970, it was agreed that insurance claims should be regarded as deliveries provided that a full list of claims could be obtained from insurance companies for checking purposes. To this point of time it has not been possible for the Wheat Quota Committee to obtain this information and the situation is being reviewed.

30. LIQUOR ACT

Function Permits

Mr. JAMIESON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) How many "function" permits have been issued under the Liquor Act, 1970, since its operation began?

(2) How many of these have been granted to—

(a) social clubs or sporting organisations;

(b) commercial interests;

(c) private individuals?

(3) What is the estimated cost to the Licensing Court of the issue of each permit?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) 245.

(2) (a) 203.

(b) 40.

(c) 2.

(3) The numbers in (1) and (2) refer only to the Perth court. The information in respect of other courts is not readily available.

31. WATER SUPPLIES

Greenhead and Lehmans

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) As no water bores have been drilled to ascertain whether potable water is available to supply Green Heads and Lehmans, has

any other area been tested and considered as a suitable water source to supply these two town-sites?

(2) If "Yes" what is the particular area?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

32.

LIQUOR ACT

Function Permits

Mr. JAMIESON, to the Minister for Police:

What is the estimated cost per application covering inquiries and other police department activities associated with the issue of "function" permits under the Liquor Act, 1970?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. Craig) replied:

It is not possible to arrive at an estimated cost for each application for function permits, as inquiries associated therewith are carried out as a part of normal police duties, and in conjunction with other work. Depending upon whether a previous inspection has been made and the type of premises, inquiries for subsequent applications may not be necessary.

33.

ROTTNEST ISLAND

Geordie Bay: Housing Development

Mr. FLETCHER, to the Minister for Lands:

Will he table the plans and in other ways give publicity through the Press and T.V. media prior to the implementation of any building project in the Geordie Bay area?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

The honourable member's request will be given full consideration when plans are finalised.

34.

ABATTOIRS

Allocation of Stock Killed

Mr. McIVER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Are Jacksons Corio Meat Packing 1965 being given space for killing at Midland in preference to local exporters?

(2) If not, what is the position?

(3) As it is not practical for exporters to operate when stock numbers are only equal to the local demand thus causing stock prices to rise, would it not be beneficial to the producer if in glut periods the allocation of killing space at Midland and Robbs Jetty were in proportion to the numbers of stock purchased each day or week?

(4) If not, why not?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Each exporter is given an allocation of killing space leased on the basis of his support to the board in respect of mutton and beef on a yearly basis.
- (3) and (4) Most export operators do operate in the off season for both local and export purposes. It is logical that exporters who operate throughout the year be given the percentage earned when stock numbers are above normal.

35. EDUCATION

Consolidated Revenue and Capital Expenditure

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What was the total expenditure from Consolidated Revenue Fund on education, as defined in Commonwealth Statistician's publication of social services expenditure, for each year 1959-60 to 1969-70 inclusive, and the estimated expenditure for 1970-71; and what percentage of total Consolidated Revenue Fund expenditure, excluding public utilities, did this represent?
- (2) What was the expenditure of a capital nature on education, on a similar basis, for the same years as in (1) and the estimated expenditure for 1970-71?
- (3) What payments were received from the Commonwealth Government for education for the same years as in (1) and the estimate for 1970-71?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) Net expenditure under the heading of "Education" as published in the Commonwealth Statistician's publication *Social Services Receipts and Expenditure* for the years 1959-60 to 1968-69 is as follows. The figures for 1969-70 and 1970-71 are not yet available and estimates have been provided. Expenditure in each year is expressed as a percentage of total Consolidated Revenue Fund expenditure excluding parts 13 to 16—Public Utilities.

	Amount	Percent-
	\$	age
1959-60	20,038,000	22.4
1960-61	22,756,000	22.7
1961-62	25,016,000	22.7
1962-63	26,922,000	23.0
1963-64	20,941,000	23.5
1964-65	34,137,000	24.0
1965-66	39,257,000	24.4
1966-67	42,572,000	24.3
1967-68	49,653,000	26.3
1968-69	56,108,000	26.5
1969-70 (Est.)	69,211,000	27.9
1970-71 (Est.)	80,347,000	28.4

- (2) The amounts provided from State sources for capital expenditure in each year from 1959-60 to 1970-71, but not necessarily expended in those years, were—

	\$
1959-60	4,547,000
1960-61	6,451,000
1961-62	6,972,000
1962-63	6,832,000
1963-64	7,594,000
1964-65	8,662,000
1965-66	8,338,000
1966-67	10,220,000
1967-68	10,646,000
1968-69	11,392,000
1969-70	14,948,000
1970-71 (Est.)	17,239,000

- (3) 1959-60 1,479,000 || 1960-61 | 2,167,000 |
| 1961-62 | 2,403,000 |
| 1962-63 | 2,762,000 |
| 1963-64 | 3,320,000 |
| 1964-65 | 5,073,000 |
| 1965-66 | 4,949,000 |
| 1966-67 | 6,851,000 |
| 1967-68 | 9,573,000 |
| 1968-69 | 7,561,000 |
| 1969-70 | 12,105,000 |
| 1970-71 (Est.) | 13,741,000 |

36.

ROADS

Mitchell Freeway: Commonwealth and State Expenditure

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What amounts of Commonwealth funds have been expended on the Mitchell Freeway under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act for the periods 1959-64, 1964-69 and since 1969, on the following—
 - (a) consultants;
 - (b) surveys;
 - (c) land acquisition;
 - (d) reclamation and dredging;
 - (e) road works;
 - (f) drainage (sand drains);
 - (g) sand filling;
 - (h) fencing;
 - (i) utilities—alterations, etc.;
 - (j) beautification;
 - (k) alterations and demolitions;
 - (l) miscellaneous;
 - (m) supervision;
 - (n) bridge construction?
- (2) What amount of State funds have been expended on the Mitchell Freeway to date on the following—
 - (a) land acquisition;
 - (b) reclamation and dredging;
 - (c) road works;
 - (d) bridge construction;
 - (e) drainage;
 - (f) sand filling and limestone;

- (g) beautification;
 - (h) fencing;
 - (i) demolitions and alterations;
 - (j) payment to contractors;
 - (k) miscellaneous,
- and the source from which the funds were obtained?

intend to legislate for this purpose. It does believe in free competition.

39 and 40. *These questions were postponed.*

41. *This question was postponed until Tuesday, the 20th October.*

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) The information requested is contained in a statement which I request permission to table.

The statement was tabled.

COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES

Disconnection for Non-Payment of Rates: Grievance

MR. McIVER (Northam) [4.53 p.m.]: My grievance is in relation to an issue which I raised previously in the House; but because of the increased number of submissions I have received I bring the matter forward once again. I refer specifically to cut-offs of domestic water supply in country areas, and I speak with particular reference to the town of Northam. At the outset I want to emphasise that I am not bringing this matter forward for political gain, as perhaps some Government members might think.

I have contacted executive officers and engineers of the Public Works Department to discuss this very issue. In the discussions each and every one of them expressed utter disgust that they had to stand by the instructions that were issued in relation to water cut-offs.

Firstly, we should examine the position of the people who are affected by such action. Up to several weeks ago a warning was given when the payment of water rates was not met on the due date, but for some unknown reason the situation at the present time is that if payment of water rates is not met the supply is cut off without warning to the occupier of the residence concerned. Such action affects many people in the Northam district, and has humiliated people of great integrity who have contributed greatly to the community and lived in the town for 40 years.

I want to emphasise three cases. In the first the maintenance officer from the department called at the house. The occupier tried to attract his attention by waving her hands at the window. Unfortunately this woman is paralysed from the waist down and is bedridden; and she was not successful in attracting the attention of the maintenance officer.

It is of paramount importance for this lady to be bathed every day, and she receives attention from the Silver Chain sisters. When the water supply was disconnected she was placed in a very invidious position. It would not be so bad if the water supply was cut off when the amount involved was high. In the three cases in question the amounts outstanding were trifling, and were all under \$3. I would be the first to agree that, if people failed to pay their water accounts for reasons which were not genuine, the water should be cut off. However, that is not the

37.

ROADS

Expenditure

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Works:

What moneys have been spent by the Government from 1959-60 to 1969-70 in the metropolitan area on the following—

- (a) acquisition of land for road purposes;
- (b) the construction of roadways;
- (c) construction of bridges;
- (d) provision of traffic lights?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (a) to (d) The information requested is also contained in a statement which I request permission to table.

The statement was tabled.

38.

PRICE CONTROL

Decision of Woolworths Ltd.

Mr. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Does he see the decision of Woolworths Ltd. aimed at discouraging suppliers from charging excessive prices at the expense of consumers as an unprecedented move towards price control?
- (2) Is such action which is contemplated by Woolworths desirable as a means of keeping down the cost of living?
- (3) Is the situation with regard to the cost of living one in which action is necessary to control price rises?
- (4) If "Yes" should not the initiative be taken by the Government rather than by individual businesses?

Sir DAVID BRAND replied:

- (1) to (4) It would seem that these questions refer to an article which appeared in *The West Australian* on Monday, the 28th September, 1970. The Government has constantly stated that it does not favour price control and does not

position in the cases I have in mind, and the people concerned should have been warned beforehand. Even a person who is convicted after a trial by a judge and jury knows the date when he is convicted.

I cannot understand why such cases have occurred in a town such as Northam, where in summer months temperatures exceeding 100 degrees are experienced on consecutive days. It will be readily realised at what disadvantage the occupiers of houses to which the water supply has been cut off are placed.

Another case concerns a lady pensioner who came in tears to see me at my home. When she stopped sobbing she informed me that she did not have the \$4 which the department required to have the water connected. I would point out to the Minister that I challenge strongly the legality of this type of action; and if his department continues in this vein he will have to reduce the charge for connection to \$3. I will endeavour to check this case to the fullest extent, but I think I am right.

I refer to section 33 (1) of the Country Areas Water Supply Act. It states that the Minister may disconnect in any manner the supply of any water to any land when any person refuses or neglects, after demand, to pay all rates and moneys due and payable by him to the Minister for water supplied to the land. The words "or neglects, after demand" are used. There they are in the Act in black and white.

When I personally took this matter up with the Under-Secretary for Works he said in a letter to me dated the 18th March, 1969—

The officer effecting the cut-off action must personally advise the occupier of the premises of the action he intends taking, or if no one is home, he must leave a notice advising the occupier of the action he has taken.

I agree with what the Under-Secretary for Works said, because it is justifiable; but I do not agree with officers of the Public Works Department disconnecting the water supply from a house without warning because of the non-payment of some paltry amount. Surely this Government has not reached such a low ebb; and the Public Works Department is not so deprived of funds that it has to attack the sick, the crippled, and the aged!

The third case related to the joyous occasion of a wedding. At five o'clock on a Friday evening the maintenance officer called at the house to disconnect the water, because the sum of \$1.75 had not been paid. How would members feel if the water supply to their premises was cut off for failure to pay trifling sums?

People are not always perfect. Sometimes they put away accounts, and neglect to make payment on the due dates. I think it will be agreed by all that the

people concerned in these matters should be approached in a humane manner, and should be permitted to make arrangements for payment at a future date, if their financial circumstances do not permit them to settle the accounts.

I say in all sincerity to the Minister that he is not aware of the situation and I cannot agree with his attitude—as indicated when he replied to a question I asked yesterday. The Minister said in reply to the question that he was aware of the requirements, but did not consider them to be unreasonable. I cannot go along with that point of view.

I contend that the present situation should be changed, and people should be warned before the water supply to their premises is cut off. I trust the Government will have a look at this matter, because by its present policy it is not gaining many friends in my electorate by requiring the maintenance officers to take direct action.

In all sincerity I ask that a re-examination be made of the situation. The people should be given a chance to pay their accounts, and they should at least be warned that their water supply will be cut off for non-payment of the rates.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Water Supplies) [5.01 p.m.]: This particular issue can tend to become an emotional one, but I want to make it quite clear that I believe the principle of cut-off for non-payment of water rates is a correct one.

Mr. Lapham: For \$1.75?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I ask the member for Karrinyup to just listen to what I have to say and then perhaps subsequently, if his party ever gets into office he can determine whether or not the Labor Party is to continue the cut-off action.

Mr. Tonkin: We determined it long ago when we were in office.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I would like to say the cut-off pattern applied in country areas under a Labor Government.

Mr. Tonkin: Well, the Minister should look at the file. He does not really know what he is talking about.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do know what I am talking about.

Mr. Tonkin: Then look at the file and see what I said about the procedure.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I want to explain the procedure which applies to cut-off action. The normal sequence of recovery action in all country areas is as follows: In the first place consumers are given one month from the date of issue of the account to make payment. Following that, a final notice is sent out requiring payment within 14 days.

Mr. McIver: Well, that did not occur in the cases I have mentioned. No warning whatsoever was given, and I would not be complaining here if a warning had been given.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The information I am supplying has been given to me by the top officer of my department—the Under-Secretary for Water Supplies—Mr. McConnell, who I believe was the Under-Secretary for Water Supplies under the previous Labor Administration. To continue: If no payment is made by the end of the 14-day period then the water is cut off within three days. As has been stated by officers of the department, endeavours are made to inform the people concerned that their water supply is to be cut off. At times, despite continual endeavours, the officers cannot discover anybody at home.

Mr. Tonkin: Do they leave a note?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: They are supposed to leave a note.

Mr. Tonkin: Well, do they do it?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am the Minister for Water Supplies—

Mr. Tonkin: So I understand.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: —and this is the action the officers in the field are supposed to take. I think it is logical—those people being human beings with somewhat the same nature as the Leader of the Opposition—that mistakes can be made.

Mr. Bertram: Oh!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: What is the matter with the member of Mt. Hawthorn? I did not say that he was human.

The next step is legal action, but this is rarely necessary. There are two prime reasons why the Government believes the cut-off action should take place. The first is an important one which will perhaps be dismissed by those who do not think deeply enough. I refer to the fact that the great majority of people do pay their rates. Why should a few not pay their rates and get away with it? Why?

Mr. McIver: There are a thousand and one reasons.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is all I want: one reason.

Mr. McIver: I have instanced the cases applying to two invalids.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is the answer I wanted from the honourable member; because what should be done in circumstances of difficulty or hardship, or anything of that kind, is for the person concerned to get in touch with the officers of the department.

Dr. Henn: Or their member of Parliament.

Mr. McIver: The Minister is missing my point; I am not complaining about the water being cut off, I am complaining about no warning being given.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have detailed my knowledge of the cut-off procedure and I believe that is the procedure which is followed.

Mr. Jamieson: The Minister had better have these two cases examined.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Of course.

Mr. Jamieson: The Minister should go back to 1965; that is where he belongs.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: These matters are frequently emotional; but it is the responsibility of the people concerned to let the department know their difficulties. The cut-off procedure is a legal one despite what the member for Northam says.

Mr. McIver: I agree with the procedure.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Steps are taken to inform people that they must pay their accounts. It is not good enough, for example, that 98 per cent. of the people should pay their bills and that 2 per cent. should get away with not paying their bills. If we allowed this to continue, what would be the end result? Before we knew where we were the 98 per cent. would be reduced to 95 per cent., and then further reduced perhaps to 90 per cent. Then 10 per cent. of the people would not be paying their bills. The end result is that the bills are finally paid by the rest of the ratepayers.

It is tremendously important that the cut-off procedure should take place. I do agree with the member for Northam, in this respect, that if mistakes are made by the officers in the field who do not follow the procedure, then steps should be taken to inform the people affected what they should do.

If the honourable member will give me the names of the people he mentioned I promise to have investigations carried out to see whether or not the departmental officers were remiss in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. I do not think I can say anything fairer than that.

It should also be remembered that the people of the State pay something in the vicinity of \$9,000,000 per year for the loss of revenue on water sales, on interest payments and sinking fund in the supplying of water to country districts. I ask: Would I be a responsible Minister if I tried to increase that amount? If the Opposition ever gets into Government I will be interested to see what action is taken regarding the cut-off procedure.

Mr. Tonkin: If the Minister looks at the file he will see what action was taken previously.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Fortunately, I think the possibility is far removed.

LAND REVALUATIONS

Rate Increases: Grievance

MR. HARMAN (Maylands) [5.08 p.m.]: In recent weeks many residents of Maylands have been shocked by the amounts shown on the rate notices that have been sent to them by the Shire of Perth. The letter I am about to quote is one I have received and it is typical of the attitude which the people have adopted since they have received their rate notices. The letter is addressed to me and reads as follows:—

Dear Sir,

As you are the member for this district, I am appealing to you to see if there is anything that can be done about the shocking rise in rates in our area in Kennedy Street. My rates last year were \$45.18. This year \$119.60. I am on a corner block and my neighbours all along my side are around \$99. I expected a reasonable rise in rates but this is out of all proportion and it is sheer robbery.

I have several letters indicating increases from \$40 to \$88, from \$31 to \$65, and so they go on. Of course, a number of people have taken action to appeal through the processes of the law.

I want to make this matter a grievance, but I also want to make it a request to the Premier to agree to a special investigation of this situation because, as I will argue, it is unjust and, in some cases, quite vicious.

The situation is the result of two occurrences. The area of the Shire of Perth has been revalued and, of course, the particular area referred to in Maylands has been included in that revaluation. Also, the Shire of Perth has struck a new rate.

A tremendous amount of development has taken place in the Maylands area, especially with respect to flat building. Land suitable for the building of flats has been sold at very high prices, mainly because the developers are seeking high blocks or level blocks which are situated close to playing areas and transport. The area I have referred to in Maylands is zoned GR4, GR5, and GR6, and the Taxation Department valuers base their valuations on the sales of blocks for flat building. The Taxation Department has put a blanket valuation over the area, based on the price of those blocks that have been sold.

The demand for flat sites has passed and no-one is now interested in buying sites in Maylands for the building of

flats. There are flats to burn in Maylands and many blocks have very few tenants. Also, once the developers have acquired the choice flat sites they are not interested in the other sites in the same zoned area. There are a number of reasons why they should not be interested, and one important reason could be that the remaining blocks are not big enough for flat development. Another important reason might be—and I know that this has occurred in most of the area—that the sewerage department will not allow any more flats to be constructed because it is impossible to have them connected to the sewer.

The people who are affected are living in an area which has been revalued because of its potential for flat development, but they cannot sell their land for flat development for the reasons I have stated. Another reason is that many people do not want to sell their homes. They have lived in those homes for a number of years and they wish to remain there. It has come as a shock to find their rates rising from \$39, \$40, and \$50 to \$119, \$125, and \$130. That has been the general pattern in the area.

Of course, the Perth Shire is culpable to the extent that it has struck a new rate based on the revaluations. However, I am informed that the shire could have struck a varied rate for this high density zone so that instead of making the rate such an impost on the people living in the zoned area, the rate could have been graduated so that it was in accord with the rates collected in other areas of the shire.

The result has been widespread suffering and despair caused to the residents in the high density areas. Many of them are living on fixed incomes, and the great majority are working people—the ordinary John Citizen. As I said, it came as a great shock to them to be suddenly saddled with a great increase in rates. Most of those people have to find an additional \$100 in order to pay their rates.

Perhaps it may be argued that these people have the right to appeal through the processes of the law. In fact I have advised people who have consulted me to do this. There are 5,000 or 6,000 homes in the area and it is beyond imagination to expect all the people concerned to have the capacity to make out an appeal or to have the drive or initiative to go through the process of going into court and conducting their own appeal. To do this would be beyond a great number of people.

Mr. Brady: There is no guarantee they would win the appeal, either.

Mr. Lapham: It is a case of Caesar to Caesar.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Is there ever a guarantee of winning an appeal?

Mr. Brady: Half the time it is a waste of time to appeal.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members are using up the member for Maylands' time.

Mr. HARMAN: This is a special problem which is affecting people living in a high density zoned area. The only recourse I can see is to ask the Premier to take the initiative and agree to request his advisers to examine the problem so that some consideration will be given by experts to these people.

I understand there may be a move to amend the Local Government Act so that some sort of notional rate can be assessed for this type of dweller. I do not know, however, whether it would be retrospective or not. If it is to be prospective it will assist people only in the future.

If there is some way of salvaging the situation so that the people concerned will, in most cases, not have to find another \$100 to pay shire rates this year, I am sure the people of Maylands would be extremely grateful.

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.16 p.m.]: I take the opportunity of replying to mention, firstly, that the chance to express grievances has developed into a motion to request me to hold an inquiry.

I suppose every member, in his turn, has a problem such as this. The shire or local authority in this area is responsible for the decision on valuation. It is in that body's hands as to whether it needs to amend the rate because of higher valuations. Similarly it could take action to reduce the rate. It is entirely the decision of the local governing body and certainly not mine.

If the people of the area are dissatisfied with the local governing body and the decisions it is making, they have recourse in the same way as everyone else; they can change a member or the whole of the shire body. The policy could perhaps be altered in such a way.

This question is not new to any of us. Even individually, we all receive rate notices which are very high indeed. I would not undertake to make any inquiries because it is not within my jurisdiction. I consider the local governing body must be independent and make its own decisions. In this way it carries the full responsibilities for its actions in a democratic system.

Mr. Harman: The same situation occurred in South Perth.

The SPEAKER: Order!

GREY KANGAROOS

Annual Increase or Decrease:

Correction of Answer

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [5.18 p.m.]: I seek the leave of the House to make a correction to an answer given yesterday.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Works desires leave to make a correction to an answer given yesterday. There being no dissentient voice, leave is granted.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I thank the House for its tolerance and understanding. The Minister for Health has asked me to explain that in question 6 of Tuesday, the 13th October, 1970, a typographical error occurred in the figures for the occurrence of grey kangaroos in the south-west. The figure should have been 1:100-150 acres; not 1:100-500 acres.

The SPEAKER: According to the *Votes and Proceedings* that is the answer given.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It should be 1:100-150 acres and not the answer which I gave at the time which was 1:100-500 acres. If it appears correctly in the *Votes and Proceedings* I assume that someone has made an alteration prior to this explanation.

The SPEAKER: I will have the matter investigated.

ROAD AND AIR TRANSPORT COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

STOCK (BRANDS AND MOVEMENT) BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Further Report

Further report of Committee adopted.

FAUNA CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works), and passed.

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [5.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

In moving this motion, I want to endeavour to clarify a mild disagreement which I had with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on the second reading debate yesterday evening.

I described the situation, as I understood it, in connection with the Painters' Registration Board—not the Builders' Registration Board—and said that the Painters' Registration Board had only once ordered remedial work to be carried out by someone other than the offending painter. I said that I was open to correction but, as I understood it, the result was that the defaulting painter did not pay on that one occasion and the board had to face up to the cost.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that this was not the case and, in response to my further query, quoted from an answer I had given him. This is in *Hansard* and is to the effect that the original painter had finally paid.

Today I checked on the file and the Under-Secretary for Works checked with the Painters' Registration Board. I was informed as late as this afternoon that in this case the board found it necessary to have the remedial work carried out by another painter at a cost of \$576. The board was unable to recover these costs from the person involved, who had left the State and could not be traced.

Consequently I was at fault in that I apparently gave a wrong answer to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who was completely entitled to assume that the painter in question had finally paid the bill. However, it appears that he did not. I make this explanation to clarify the position and I regret any misunderstanding that may have occurred.

Mr. Graham: The Minister's apology is accepted without malice.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is not an apology.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister cannot make a second speech.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

GREY KANGAROOS

Annual Increase or Decrease: Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Guthrie) [5.28 p.m.]: I wish to explain to the House that I have investigated the item mentioned a little earlier in connection with the answer to question 6 yesterday. I find that the *Votes and Proceedings* are, in fact, incorrect. I have not yet signed them and they will be corrected to the answer given by the Minister yesterday before they are signed.

BILLS (3): THIRD READING

1. Painters' Registration Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works), and transmitted to the Council.

2. Traffic Act Amendment Bill.

3. Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), and transmitted to the Council.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 23rd September, on the following motion by Mr. H. D. Evans:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the dairying industry of Western Australia in respect of—

- (1) the costs, returns and economic trends within the industry;
- (2) the effects of the sectionalised control of the industry;
- (3) the probable results of the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme upon the dairy industry;

and make such recommendations which could assist in resolving the problems revealed by the investigation.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.29 p.m.]: In moving a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to undertake an inquiry into the dairying industry in Western Australia, the member for Warren provided a review of many aspects of the industry in this State.

Before I proceed any further, I think it would be interesting to look at some of the points the honourable member made when he moved for an inquiry to be made. He said that the dairying industry in Western Australia has gradually declined over a period of years. This, of course, is factual. However he went on to say that the industry has become unwieldy. I do not know whether it is merely a matter of the choice of words, but to me it is rather strange because he then proceeded to say that the industry is complex and disunited. I for one would say that statement is exaggerated and not correct. In the *Farmers' Weekly* of the 19th March the following appeared:—

West Australian wholemilk producers at the Farmers' Union wholemilk section conference held at Pinjarra last week voted to continue negotiations with butterfat producers on the proposed establishment of a single dairy authority in the State.

That was something that had never happened before in the history of the dairying industry. Two sections of the industry got together for the first time and discussed the problems facing the industry. At the meeting they agreed that the discussions would be continued. When I say it was the first time, I want to make it perfectly clear that I mean it was the first time the two sections of the industry had got together to discuss their problems as an industry.

For the member for Warren to turn round and say that the industry has become unwieldy, complex, and disunited, suggests to me that he is completely out of touch with the industry or that he is completely misinformed.

In the information he supplied to the House, the honourable member went to a considerable amount of trouble to suggest that the problem concerned not only Western Australia. As a matter of fact, about three or four pages of the *Hansard* report of the honourable member's speech are devoted to the fact that the problem is an Australian problem, and even a world-wide problem. I do not know how on earth we could expect a Select Committee inquiring into problems of the dairying industry in Western Australia to cover the problems in the whole of Australia and in the whole world. As a matter of fact, in the course of his remarks the member for Warren said—

This, of course, is overshadowed by the European Common Market, which embraces some countries within the European economy, and they have an excess in the vicinity of 300,000 tons of butter at the moment.

I have not taken that out of context, because he was using that argument in relation to the problems associated with the dairying industry.

So in discussing this matter I want to make it quite clear that it is not possible for Western Australia to embark on an inquiry into a problem which concerns not only this State. Western Australia does not even produce sufficient butterfat for its own needs—a matter to which the honourable member referred, and to which I intend to refer later. This problem is also to be found in other States. I could refer to Victoria, because the honourable member made a considerable amount of comment about that State. So I wish to make it perfectly clear, in prefacing my remarks, that it is quite outside the scope of a committee of inquiry to supply the answer to a problem that is also Australia-wide and, indeed, world-wide.

Mr. Tonkin: To whom should we look for the solution of the problem?

Mr. NALDER: The information presented by the member for Warren is, of course, well-known. It is not as though

he put up new arguments, new figures, new suggestions, or new answers to the problem. Everything he said is well-known to the industry, to the State Government, and to the Commonwealth Government. I emphasise that it is well-known to the Commonwealth Government, because it has endeavoured to overcome the difficulties which the industry is facing in Australia.

It is not my intention this evening to discuss these matters but rather to deal with the terms of the inquiry proposed by the member for Warren. In the first instance, the honourable member proposes that there be an inquiry into the costs, returns, and economic trends within the industry. In this connection, it can be said that already a great deal is known of these matters because, indeed, of the economic surveys which have already been made. It is necessary for the implementation of the Dairy Farm Consolidation Plan that information is kept up to date.

It is also necessary for the setting of standards for an economic unit for an amalgamated farm under the terms of the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme that information be right up to date. In addition, the Milk Board must of necessity keep itself well informed of costs and returns within the liquid milk industry. Trends in production are, of course, important and the Government is concerned that at the present time it is necessary to import approximately one-third of the butter consumed in this State, whereas in 1965-66 we produced sufficient for our own requirements. I have the figures here for the information of the House. In 1965-66 we imported 2,893 boxes of butter for local consumption, representing 72.3 tons; whereas in 1969-70 we imported 119,795 boxes, totalling 2,994.9 tons. As I said, that represents approximately one-third of the butter consumed in this State.

A number of factors have been involved, including relatively poor seasons, increasing population, increasing demands for liquid milk, and, more recently, increasing interest in beef production. I think everybody appreciates that last factor, and recommendations have been made by many people in various sections of the industry in this State, and also by representatives of the industry in the Eastern States and the Minister for Primary Industry, to the effect that it is advisable for people to diversify in the interests of helping to solve some of the production problems we are facing.

Nevertheless, total milk production remains fairly constant and this production is obtained from a reduced number of dairy farms and from considerably fewer cows. In fact, there has been increased production per farm and increased production per cow, resulting in overall improved economic conditions in the industry. I

would like to inform the House of the position regarding the numbers of milk cattle, which are as follows:—

Cattle for Milk Production

Year	Number
1966	209,000
1967	199,000
1968	192,000
1969	183,000
1970	183,000

The figures of milking cows are as follows:—

Year	Number
1966	109,291
1967	102,920
1968	99,547
1969	97,122
1970	Not yet available

The next figures relate to the total milk production, and the figures are in millions of gallons—

Year	Milk Production (Gallons)
1966	62,024,000
1967	55,969,000
1968	54,876,000
1969	57,851,000
1970	57,751,000

The results of herd testing are as follows:—

Year	Milk per Cow (Gallons)
1967	606
1968	644
1969	673
1970	749

Year	Butterfat per Cow
1967	252
1968	269
1969	278
1970	303

Year	No. of Cows per Herd
1967	58
1968	62
1969	68
1970	72

It is quite evident that the milk per cow increased considerably from 606 gallons per head to 749 gallons per head, and the same trend applies to butterfat. I also have with me figures relating to the production of manufacturing milk, liquid milk and cream, and sales milk and as cream, which are as follows:—

Year	Manufacturing Milk (Gallons)
1966	40,974,000
1967	34,091,000
1968	32,135,000
1969	33,648,000
1970	31,169,000

Year	Liquid Milk and Cream (Includes Milk used on farm) (Gallons)
1966	21,050,000
1967	21,878,000
1968	22,741,000
1969	24,203,000
1970	26,582,000
Year	Sales Milk and as Cream (Gallons)
1966	18,251,000
1967	19,168,000
1968	20,446,000
1969	21,779,000
1970	23,306,000

The figures indicate that although the number of cows for milk production was reduced, the milk production itself did not vary a great deal, because it went from 62,024,000 gallons in 1966 to 57,751,000 gallons in 1970.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you know anything about the butterfat section?

Mr. NALDER: Yes, the honourable member's motion is for a Select Committee to inquire into the whole of the dairying industry.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That is right.

Mr. NALDER: The figures I have given refer to both sections of the industry—milk production and butterfat production. If the honourable member had been listening carefully he would not have interjected.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It is not coming through at all.

Mr. NALDER: I gave the figures in relation to manufacturing milk, liquid milk and cream, and the sales of milk as cream. I was endeavouring to show that the milk per cow has risen considerably, as has the butterfat per cow and the number of cows per herd. While the herds have decreased the number of cattle in the herds has increased. This information is valuable particularly in considering the matter before us.

It would be a complete waste of time—not only of members of Parliament and the officers of the House, but also of the members of the industry—if we went to the extent of endeavouring to collect figures which we already know; or if we tried to obtain information which we already have on hand. Because of this I feel it is quite unrealistic to suggest that an inquiry be conducted into the matter under discussion.

Let us consider the second aspect of the proposal put forward by the member for Warren. This suggested an inquiry into the effects of the sectionalised control of the industry. In this connection it is obvious that the industry is composed of two major sections. It is equally obvious why this is so.

The history of the situation, not only as it applies to Western Australia, but as it relates to other States of the Commonwealth and other countries of the world is exactly the same. We have two sections of the industry—the whole-milk section and the butterfat section.

The liquid milk section as we know it grew out of the manufacturing section of the industry—initially as a minor portion; but it is now a substantial portion which is still expanding.

It is not necessary for me to go into the history of this matter because a reference to *Hansard* will show the history of the whole-milk industry in Western Australia; it will show how the industry started and how the initial legislation was prepared. This is a very important section of the industry in this State and it is doing a remarkably good job. I say that without fear of contradiction. It gives satisfaction not only to the whole-milk producers but also to the consumers.

The complaints received in connection with this part of the industry from the consumer section are practically negligible. We do hear the odd complaint which might concern deliveries and so on; there might be the odd occasion when something goes wrong, but, by and large, the complaints are few and far between.

Thousands of consumers in Western Australia—both in the metropolitan area and in the country areas—are in a very happy position as a result of the activities of the producers of whole milk, in the first place, and also because of the activities of various other sections of the industry—those in the middle group who cart milk from the farms to the factories; the treatment plants, and the service given by those who deliver milk to the consumers' door.

We have good reason to express our appreciation of these people for the work they are carrying out. There is every reason to believe that more dairies at present producing for manufacturing purposes will, in the future, be used to augment the liquid milk supply.

As I said earlier, there is no necessity for me to go over the history of this industry, because I think it is well known to members of this House; and I feel sure we all appreciate the tremendous strides the industry has made in the last 10 or 20 years.

I might say at once that there is no sharp division of interests between the two sections. The milk surplus to milk quotas, which is of necessity produced by licensed dairymen, can be marketed, and is marketed, for manufacturing purposes, using the facilities provided for the manufacturing section of the industry.

Within the dairying industry itself this interdependence of the two sections is well appreciated. Conferences of industry

leaders have been held and are continuing in an effort to evolve procedures which can improve the returns of farmers who might be producing for manufacturing purposes, to bring them to a level more equitable with those in the liquid milk industry; having regard, of course, to the responsibilities carried by each section.

I would now like to refer to the paper from which I quoted earlier, dated the 19th March. I now quote from page 4 of the *Farmers' Weekly* of Thursday, the 19th March, 1970, as follows:—

Wholemilk section president, Mr. D. P. Eckersley, and vice-president, Mr. R. W. Skidmore, had represented their section in joint committee discussions with dairy section president, Mr. T. R. Noakes, and dairy executive adviser, Mr. F. J. Oates.

They presented a report on their views of how the single authority should be constituted. However, they differed in some respects from the views of the dairy section joint committee members.

Mr. H. D. Evans: They agreed in broad principle that there should be a single authority.

Mr. NALDER: I have not disputed this. I would like to indicate what this authority said as a result of the conference. It said—

Throughout the debate it was emphasised that the two reports put forward by the section leaders were only to be used as a basis for discussion. Neither was a firm proposal for the establishment of a single dairy authority.

When some agreement was reached, a proposal would be taken back to the two sections at a joint special conference or at two special section conferences.

Mr. Eckersley and Mr. Skidmore said in their report that they envisaged the establishment of an authority with similar representation to the Milk Board of W.A.

They agreed there was a need for a single authority. They also agreed that to achieve maximum economic benefit from that authority all production would need to be vested in it.

It is not necessary for me to quote any further from this paper. Should any member wish to refer to this matter it is to be found on page 4 of the *Farmers' Weekly* dated Thursday, the 19th March.

I quoted this extract to show that both sections of the industry have got together and reached a basis for further discussion. What value could there be in the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate sections of the industry which have got together, discussed the matter, and, having reached agreement on certain aspects of

of their discussion, voted to continue the discussions on the problems involved? What could members of this House do to improve such a situation?

The Government—no matter what its colour—would be foolish in the extreme if it precipitated a situation which has already moved along the road to a satisfactory solution of the problems affecting the industry. It is my firm opinion that these matters should be left to the common sense and goodwill of those involved in the industry; it should be left to them to further this situation to enable a proposal to be submitted which is mutually beneficial.

I am equally sure that any proposal to improve integration by allocating a farmer an initial quota of six gallons a day would be a retrograde step leading to fragmentation of the production side of the liquid milk industry and to gross inefficiency in the initial periods.

I think we would all agree that in the face of declining supplies of milk for manufacturing purposes, it must become more difficult for dairy factories to operate economically, and it is often suggested that some should be closed in the interests of rationalisation. This is all very well if the other fellow's factory is rationalised or closed down, or put out of business. Which one is to be left: The one first established or the one which spent the most money?

Mr. H. D. Evans: You are dealing with two sections out of five. What about the others? Do they not count?

Mr. NALDER: What contribution can the honourable member or any of the other members of this Parliament make in connection with this matter? Does it matter if cream or manufacturing milk passes one factory and goes to another closer to the metropolitan area? Most of the manufactured product goes to the metropolitan area in any case.

Accordingly I see no reason to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the particular point raised in the member for Warren's second submission. The honourable member's third proposal suggests an inquiry into the probable results of the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme upon the dairy industry. I have been in this House for 24 years.

Mr. Toms: Too long!

Mr. NALDER: In all those years I have never known of a suggestion being made that a Select Committee be appointed to look into the probable results of anything. It smacks very much of gazing into a crystal ball; of looking over the horizon and endeavouring to tell people what is likely to happen.

Mr. Tonkin: Did not the Government carry out an inquiry into the possible results of the use of tidal power in the north?

Mr. NALDER: Has that anything to do with this subject?

Mr. Tonkin: You said that since you have been here there has been no inquiry into possible results.

Mr. NALDER: We all know that some amalgamation of farms previously used for dairying has taken place. We have some idea of the number of farms which might conceivably be available for this purpose, but we cannot have any idea of how many dairy farmers may wish to sell or how many may wish to buy.

Mr. Brady: The Japanese will be able to tell you that.

Mr. NALDER: There could be the situation of a farmer saying he proposes to take up dairying, and in the next few months circumstances might change which would prompt him to sell his property. Time alone will tell what the situation is likely to be.

I am sure the State Government's agreement with the Commonwealth Government to proceed with the proposal submitted by that Government will continue to have distinct advantages. For the life of me I cannot see that any useful purpose will be served by appointing a committee to inquire into the probable results of the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme upon the dairy industry. Accordingly I do not think we should agree to this third proposal and I oppose the motion submitted by the member for Warren.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [6.01 p.m.]: Unlike the Minister, I support the motion.

Mr. Nalder: Do you want to go on the committee?

Mr. FLETCHER: No, but I would like to say that the Leader of the Opposition interjected when the Minister was speaking and the Minister disagreed with the interjection even before he had heard it.

Mr. May: That is not unusual.

Mr. FLETCHER: The Minister said that the Leader of the Opposition was talking nonsense, but he had not even heard the interjection of the Leader of the Opposition before he declared he was talking nonsense. He could have at least displayed the courtesy of listening to the interjection, because I have heard far more logical arguments from this side of the House than I have ever heard from the Minister.

Mr. Nalder: I heard the interjection.

Mr. FLETCHER: The Minister did not

Mr. Nalder: It was not dealing with the subject.

Mr. Tonkin: I will deal with the subject a little later.

Mr. Nalder: O.K.

Mr. FLETCHER: I have no doubt, judging by the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition that he will tear the Minister's remarks to strips with logical argument. The Minister's arguments were certainly not logical.

It might seem surprising that I should buy into an argument which appears essentially rural. However, as the Minister said, the subject of the motion touches on the metropolitan area, and I would like to deal in particular with the second part of the motion which is "the effects of the sectionalised control of the industry." I think members will find my comment is relevant to that particular aspect of the motion. I will leave other aspects to those who come from rural areas and who know more about the subject than I do.

I am concerned with the arrival of milk on the doorstep, and how it arrives; and it is with this matter I will deal. I asked various questions five years ago and others more recently and by quoting these I wish to reveal some interesting comparisons. The board is supposed to control this industry, including the delivery of milk to the doorstep, but figures will reveal that a disproportionate number of licenses is held by treatment plants and as a consequence these plants have a disproportionate control of the industry.

The Minister might say that the treatment plants are still subject to the board, but I wish to give some comparisons, which are, as I have said, very revealing. On the 4th August, 1965, on page 70 of *Hansard*, I asked the following questions:—

- (1) How many licenses are current to milk vendors serving residential areas?
- (2) How many vendors have a license for only one area?
- (3) How many vendors hold a license for more than one, two, three, to maximum?

The Minister replied to the effect that there were 331 licenses for the metropolitan area and that 80 vendors had a license for only one area.

On the 8th October this year I asked further questions to which the Minister replied—

- (1) A milk vendor's (milkman's) license entitles the licensee to sell milk in a specified district. At the 30th June, 1970, 203 licensees held 554 milk vendor (milkman's) licenses.

Five years previously 80 vendors held one license and now 79 hold one license. In 1965, 41 vendors held two licenses and now 50 hold two. On the previous date 16 held three licenses and now 37 hold three. In 1965, three vendors held five licenses while now eight licensees hold five licenses. However, this is not the important point.

The theme which I wish to develop—and I ask the House to note this—is that one licensee now holds 29 licenses. That is rather staggering. Another holds 57 licenses. Brownes Dairy Pty. Ltd. holds four milk vendor's licenses for four districts. This is considerably fewer than in the period I previously mentioned, but I understand that Brownes has now been taken over by Peters, which company may not be so interested in milk delivery. What I want members to realise and concern themselves about is that one licensee now holds 57 licenses and another holds 29.

I could go on quoting other questions and answers, but statistics can become boring. However, I am sure members will accept that those figures are very revealing and should be the subject of the inquiry suggested by the member for Warren. In one of the answers the Minister admits that milk rounds are sold on a gallonage basis and the price per gallon is a matter for negotiation between buyer and seller.

I am not convinced that the situation as outlined in the answers to the questions asked in 1965 and this year is in the best interests of the community, including the milkman who leaves milk on John Citizen's doorstep. I am satisfied that with so many licenses being held by big companies, such companies are in a position to impose conditions on those who deliver the milk or to whom they sublet by contract or other arrangements. I do not know whether companies can buy licenses, or how they acquire them, but that matter could also be the subject of inquiry.

I would now like to quote from answers I received on the 8th September this year. I asked the Minister the following:—

- (1) Would he advise the method of appointment of the present chairman of the Milk Board?
- (2) Was it a ministerial appointment?

The Minister replied that it was not a ministerial appointment and that he was appointed in accordance with board policy. I also asked whether the position had been advertised, and the Minister admitted that it had not. As, in effect, it is a semi-Government instrumentality, I think it is incumbent upon the Government to ensure that the position of chairman is advertised to give all those with the requisite qualifications the opportunity to apply for such a highly-paid position.

I would point out to the House that the State Electricity Commission, for example, places on every notice board throughout the commission notice of any vacancy which exists for personnel, and anyone within the commission can apply. I would submit that officers of the Department of Agriculture might wish to apply for the position of Chairman of the Milk Board and I suggest that this position, when vacant, should be advertised on notice boards throughout the Department of Agriculture and, in fact, right throughout the State Public Service in order to give qualified people an opportunity to apply. I suggest further that it should be advertised not only throughout the Public Service, but also in the Press.

I am not reflecting on the qualification of the present incumbent; he might be a good man. The suggestions I am making could be the subject of inquiry. The Minister quite definitely answered in the negative when I asked—

- (6) If not within the Department of Agriculture, does he not agree that this would be a logical place to look for a suitably qualified person?

That question was referring to the advertising of the vacancy. As I have said, the Minister said, "No." I should perhaps say he did not say it. I have no doubt the board said, "No."

Mr. Nalder: You were correct the first time. I said "No."

Mr. FLETCHER: In answer to my questions (1) and (2) which I quoted above the Minister said—

- (1) and (2) The matter was considered by Cabinet and the appointment was made by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister in accordance with the requirements of the Milk Act.

As a result of the answer to that question, I consulted the Milk Act. I have no doubt the Minister knows it even better than I do. However, I wanted to find out where the authority was given for the appointment of the chairman, and by what method his qualifications were measured. Section 10 reads—

- (1) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act there shall be a board, to be called "The Milk Board of Western Australia" constituted as hereinafter provided.

Section 11 reads—

- (1) The Board shall comprise the offices of a member as Chairman and two other members . . .

Subsection (2) reads—

The Governor shall appoint to each of those offices a person, who is recommended by the Minister.

But that is not the chairman. That section deals with other personnel associated with the board. There is no direct reference in sections 10 or 11 to the chairman and how he shall be appointed. It merely refers to recommendation. I have no doubt that a panel of names is submitted to the Minister for this purpose.

What I am grizzling about is the fact that the panel should be so restrictive, because only a limited number of people would be aware of the existence of the vacancy. Therefore, I believe the position should be advertised not only throughout the Public Service, but also in the Press.

A subsequent question I asked on the 9th September was—

What is the salary of the Chairman of the Milk Board?

The Minister replied—

\$12,875 gross per annum.

I think it is wrong that the chairman should be appointed in the manner he is when he receives such a high salary. His appointment is made in a rather casual manner and I take exception to that because I am sure, as a result of other questions I asked concerning the qualifications necessary for those associated with milk plants and so on, that such people might like to apply for the position. They must obtain degrees and other qualifications through the University, but as the appointment is made secretly, they have no opportunity to apply. I have read briefly from the Act to demonstrate the manner in which the chairman is appointed. It is not incumbent upon the Minister or his department to advertise the position in the manner I have suggested.

I would point out to the Minister that my questions were not asked as a result of my curiosity or on my own initiative. I asked them as a result of approaches made to me by milk vendors in my electorate who are dissatisfied because they have no representation on the board. I have quoted the provisions which indicate how the board is constituted and none of those appointed are milk vendors, despite the fact that milk companies can own up to 57 licenses. Milk vendors must work for milk companies on terms and conditions dictated by the companies. Is that not a ground for an inquiry such as is suggested under part (2) of the motion of the member for Warren?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. FLETCHER: Just prior to the tea suspension I was making reference to the fact that the Chairman of the Milk Board receives a salary of \$12,875 per annum. During the tea suspension I inquired as to the salaries paid to suburban members of Parliament, and I discovered that, together with our allowance, our salary is \$9,100 gross compared with \$12,875 paid to the Chairman of the Milk Board. That

leaves a difference of \$3,775, and the Chairman of the Milk Board would have far fewer worries than a member of Parliament, particularly a metropolitan member.

I would go further and suggest that if the job were advertised there could be a stampede of members applying for it because of the attractive conditions applicable to it.

Mr. Nalder: That is a good reason why it is not advertised.

Mr. FLETCHER: If it were, parliamentarians, or a parliamentarian, could find a more remunerative occupation with far fewer worries.

I was also speaking about the licenses issued as at the 4th August, 1965. The total number was 331, and on the 8th October, 1970, the number issued totalled 554, which meant that during that period there was an increase of 223 licenses in the metropolitan area. This indicates the growth over that period. However, as I said earlier, my concern is that the additional licenses are falling into fewer and fewer hands. Companies acquire the licenses—indeed, one company has 29 licenses and another has 57, which means that 86 licenses are held by two companies.

This, in turn, means that 86 people work under conditions imposed upon them by only two companies which hold the 86 licenses. Those companies can say, in effect, to those 86 people who operate under the licenses, "If you don't like the conditions imposed on you, you can get out. You can take it or leave it." Therefore, the people concerned would have to do more and more calls or they would be out of a job.

Figures reveal the increased growth in the metropolitan area, and the fact that fewer people are involved demonstrates that more and more work has to be done by those who are engaged in this occupation. I can see a parallel developing between the milk industry and the oil industry in so far as the conditions under which the operators work are concerned. The Automotive Chamber of Commerce circulated a booklet, which all members received, and it shows the conditions that are imposed on service station proprietors, or tenants of the oil companies. They have to work long hours for little remuneration. If they do not like the conditions they have to walk out with no equity in their business; or, alternatively, they can be driven out and in the process they lose what they pay as ingoing.

The same could apply to those engaged in the milk industry because so many licenses are held by such a small number of people. In this regard I would like to draw the attention of the House to section 9 of the Milk Act. This section is a

very small one so I shall read it in its entirety. It is as follows:—

(1) The Governor may from time to time on the recommendation of the Minister by order in council—

- (a) divide any dairy area into districts;
- (b) define the boundaries of a district;
- (c) alter the boundaries of a district;
- (d) unite two or more districts into one district;
- (e) subdivide any district into two or more districts;
- (f) abolish any district.

(2) When a dairy area is divided into districts under subsection (1) of this section persons may, in the carrying on of business as milk vendors under this Act be restricted to any specified one or more of such districts.

My purpose in reading that section was to show the influence that can be brought to bear on those who deliver milk to our doorstep.

As a consequence of the grumblings of those who deliver milk in my area, I asked the people concerned to present me with a case. I wrote to a Mr. So-and-so—I shall not mention his name—pointing out that Mr. H. D. Evans (the member for Warren) had introduced a motion into the Legislative Assembly, and I attached a copy of the motion. I then went on further to say—

Under Section (2) of the Motion, I may be able to speak on vendors' dissatisfaction in regard to treatment by the Board.

The Motion will not be debated prior to Wednesday week, 7th October, so if you would care to forward to me, prior to that date, any material by way of correspondence, or suggestions for improvement of Board administration or representation thereon, I may be able to contribute to the debate.

You will, I have no doubt, first wish to discuss this with your organisation or association, or others who handle milk to the consumer.

I received a reply to that letter, the first part of which reads—

Over the past months many complaints have been made throughout the State and many questions asked about the activities of the Milk Board.

The person who wrote to me then went on to say that he would like to ask the Minister the following questions—and the questions were set out. I would like the

House to know the phraseology used in the questions because it demonstrates the concern felt by these people. The questions were as follows:—

1. Does he consider the time has arrived to look into the activities of this Board?

2. Would the Minister advise all particulars as to how the present appointment was made and whether or not the position was advertised to encourage applications from people suitably qualified to hold this position?

I have dealt with that aspect. To continue—

3. Would the Minister advise the salary of the Chairman of the Milk Board?

I have dealt with that, too. The questions went on—

4. Would the Minister advise what level of qualifications is required to be held by inspectors of the Board, and are all of the present staff properly qualified?

5. Is it a fact that the level of qualifications of senior staff in the Department of Agriculture is higher than that of Inspectors of the Milk Board?

6. What would be the estimated savings to milk producers if the Board was abolished and its functions with milk producers performed by the Department of Agriculture?

I have dealt with most of the questions raised. However, further to that, I want to quote excerpts from the rest of the letter. The writer suggests that an investigation by a Select Committee would not mean that there was any suggestion of abolishing the board, and he went on to say—

... but circumstances throughout the State indicate that there is every justification for restructuring so that the Board becomes something which is up-to-date with modern thinking and requirements in the dairy industry. There is no doubt that the present set-up is unbalanced and gives no consideration to the amount of capital which various sections of the industry have invested.

Further down the letter stated—

It is recognised that there are never-ending examples of the existence of what is practically a police state of affairs under present control. It is further recognised that the Board shows no desire—or perhaps it has not the knowledge—to assist the industry, and this despite the fact that Boards in other States of Australia are “assisting” Boards rather than “policing” Boards. It is a fact that only a select committee of enquiry

will bring out the truth of matters as they stand today, because the small man is too frightened to air his views for fear of reprisals.

A little later on I will give at least one example of that last statement relating to reprisals. It concerned one of my constituents. Further down the letter went on to state—

The appointments to the Board are open to question, and this alone needs a complete investigation.

A select committee would be well advised to look at the manner in which the Milk Board functions in Queensland—it is freely acknowledged that in that State the Board follows a most successful administrative policy.

The Board could very well function as a division of the Department of Agriculture—the senior officers of this Department are far better qualified to handle all farmers’ problems than is the Milk Board.

That matter could well be the subject of investigation, as has been suggested by my correspondent and also the honourable member who introduced the motion. To continue—

This fact has been recognised by the Government because it will not allow Board Staff to advise on many aspects of dairy farming, more particularly on the aspect of the production of quality milk. This very great responsibility has been passed over to the Department of Agriculture.

My correspondent develops a theme that the Department of Agriculture has a highly-skilled and qualified staff. The final paragraph of the letter reads as follows:—

The determination of a fair return for all sections of the industry, and at the same time offering maximum protection to the consumer, could best be met by having an independent cost enquiry held at regular intervals, and this enquiry should be conducted by qualified people and not by unqualified staff in a hit or miss manner as applies at the present time.

In my view, those who were responsible for that letter compiled, in a concise manner, a splendid case and I have pleasure in putting their submissions to the House in support of the motion moved by the member for Warren.

The honourable member did not move the motion merely to embarrass the Government; he moved it because he knew of the dissatisfaction that exists in the metropolitan area and in other parts of the State.

I have already read section 9 of the Milk Act, which definitely states that areas can be divided, subdivided, and subdivided again. In fact, for want of a better

word, the division of areas can be gerrymandered. Preferential treatment can be shown to some at the expense of others, and this causes dissatisfaction. This, too, is a matter which could be the subject of inquiry; and, as my correspondent suggested, the discrepancy that exists between the amount the dairy farmer receives for his product and what the consumers pay for it should also be the subject of investigation. Dairy farmers receive such a small return that many of them are getting out of the industry. Yet, at the same time, others are thriving at the dairy farmer's expense. It is for those reasons I asked certain questions in the House and the member for Warren moved his motion.

A short time ago I said that I would refer to a case involving one of my constituents. I can give this person's name because he no longer lives in this State. I think he was of Teutonic extraction and his name was Seebascher.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Not Earbasher?

Mr. Dunn: What did you say his name was?

Mr. FLETCHER: I know the connotation that can be put upon that name. This man was a terrific earbasher; he nearly drove me to desperation.

Mr. Cash: We all have our problems.

Mr. FLETCHER: At first I wished he would go away and leave me alone because I have enough problems of my own. However, his case was so involved and difficult to pin down that I listened to him and I found that not only was he in my hair but he was also in the hair of the Milk Board.

Mr. Nalder: He became a Fletcher-basher.

Mr. FLETCHER: I will accept that. As I said, he had got in the hair of the Milk Board to such an extent that I believe the board restricted him to an area that was completely uneconomic. It would be the same as reducing an area that a person in this Parliament represents to the size of the town hall.

This unfortunate person ended up representing an area that was predominantly industrial; there were very few places to which he could deliver bottles of milk. He gave me the treatment to such an extent that I firmly believe the fellow was almost mentally deranged as a result of the treatment he received. That is why I asked the following questions of the Minister:—

(11) If a zone is sold, is the purchase price based on gallons or customers?

(12) If so, or in any case, what is the method of valuation?

The Minister replied—

(11) Milk rounds are sold on a gallonage basis.

(12) The price per gallon is a matter for negotiation between buyer and seller.

I know who sold it but I do not know who bought it. It is conceivable that this is one of the 57 licenses I mentioned previously, and the buyer could buy it at his price.

Where is the justice or equity in a case like that, where a small businessman can be driven out of his job? He was driven out of his job, and, presumably, out of this State, and, conceivably, out of his mind. I do not know where he is now. The only relief I have is that he is no longer worrying me with his problem; but an injustice was done under the existing set-up, and if it was done once it can be done again. While section 9 remains as it is, there is the opportunity to do it. As a consequence, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the member for Warren.

MR. TONKIN (Melville)—Leader of the Opposition [7.47 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker, the matter before the House is the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the dairying industry.

Inquiries by Select Committees do not cost very much. Over the years some of them have proved to be quite worth while. One naturally thinks immediately of those with which one has been connected, and I think of the Select Committee of Inquiry into the question as to whether or not chiropractors should be registered. The outcome of that Select Committee, in due course, was a Bill before this House in connection with the registration of chiropractors, although there had previously been very substantial opposition to such a course.

Over the years, quite a number of Select Committees have made very useful recommendations as a result of their inquiries. For some reason or other, the Government is very fond of having inquiries for which it must pay a considerable sum of money, but it sets its face against any inquiry moved from this side of the House. Quite recently some figures were given to the House which showed that almost \$5,000,000 had been spent by this Government—of which the Minister for Agriculture is an important member—for all sorts of inquiries.

The Minister said that in the time he has been in this House—and it has been a long time—he has never heard of an inquiry into something that is probable. If members will refer to page 1020 of the latest *Hansard*, they will see that W. D. Scott & Company Pty. Ltd. carried out an inquiry, which was authorised by the Minister for Agriculture and Electricity, at a cost of \$10,750. That inquiry was a study of the economics of a proposed "S" chain for sheep and lambs. Is that not

an inquiry into the probable result of something? It is an inquiry into the economics of a proposed "S" chain. In other words, the department wanted to know what would happen if and when the "S" chain were put into operation. Therefore, before the department put the chain into operation, it had an inquiry carried out into the probable effect of it. Yet the Minister gets up in this House and says that in all the time he has been here he has never heard of an inquiry into something that is probable.

Mr. Nalder: There is no comparison at all with your proposition.

Mr. TONKIN: It is the same thing.

Mr. Nalder: It is certainly not the same thing.

Mr. TONKIN: What are feasibility studies? Surely, feasibility studies are studies into the probable effect of a course of action. If one looks at the Premier's answer to this question, which reveals that \$5,000,000 was spent, one will find that a very large portion of that expenditure was incurred in feasibility studies—in other words, to find out the probable effect of certain courses of action.

Listen to this one: \$18,500 was paid to Civil & Civic Pty. Ltd. for a feasibility study of the redevelopment of W.A. Meat Exports Works, which was authorised by the Minister for Agriculture. That was an inquiry, at a very substantial cost, to find out what could and might be done with the W.A. Meat Export Works in order to bring about a different result—in other words, an inquiry into the probable effect of taking a certain line of action.

There are other examples which do not concern the Minister for Agriculture. On page 1022 there is mention of a payment of \$15,558 to Rendel and Partners for a report on the effect of the proposed causeway between Garden Island and Point Peron on port development in Cockburn Sound—a report on the effect of something that is proposed.

Compare that with the proposition that is now before us. The member for Warren has moved that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the dairying industry in Western Australia in respect of the probable results of the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme upon the dairying industry. What is the difference between that proposed inquiry and the one authorised by the Government? I will state the difference. The inquiry advocated by the member for Warren will be at trifling cost, but the inquiry which was authorised by the Government was at very substantial cost.

As the Minister has admitted that there is a problem confronting the dairying industry, the very least we can do is to make some inquiry into it in the hope that we will find some solutions. But what

attitude does the Minister adopt? He says, "We cannot do anything; nobody can do anything. It is a world-wide problem." We must conclude from that that if we have world-wide problems we do not attempt to solve them. We just say, "They are too much for us." We do not have an inquiry. We do not look for a solution. We just let the problems work themselves out. If that is the Government's attitude, it is not ours.

I consider that the member for Warren put up a particularly good case in support of his proposition. I do not propose to go over the ground again in any particular, but I do want to remind the Government of a few things. When the Government was on the hustings in 1958, attempting to become the Government, it was all out to win support in every direction, with all sorts of promises. Here is one statement made by the Premier—

"The rural industry is in need of a boost."

We conclude from that that if we put the Liberal-Country Party into office it will give the rural industry a boost. The Premier went on to say—

"We will make available additional finance for research into all branches of agriculture. This research will help the farmer to produce more pasture and carry more stock to the acre, thereby easing one of the greatest worries of the primary producers to-day—namely, falling incomes and rising costs of production."

The Government promised to undertake research and provide money for research in order to find a solution to these problems.

Mr. Nalder: Which it has.

Mr. TONKIN: Now the Government tells us that an inquiry is of no use, that the problem is world-wide, that Governments cannot do anything about it, so inquiries are futile.

The Minister for Agriculture interjected to say, "That is what the Government did." Let us see if he can make the same interjection in the next statement. This was a proposal for a revolving fund of £500,000, or \$1,000,000. I will give it to the House word for word, so that there will be no misrepresentation about this. The Premier said—

The dairying industry of the South West faces many problems because the average size of dairy herds is so small. Holdings must be made more efficient through expansion of the area under pasture.

The clearing of heavily timbered country, where the majority of small herd farms are established, represents a heavy financial capital outlay. As the dairy farmer is unable to provide

finance, we will assist him to clear the land so as to build up the carrying capacity to a point where he is farming on a sound basis.

To achieve this we will make available half a million pounds in a revolving fund. The money would be obtained through the Rural and Industries Bank or by guarantee through private banks. Such advances will be made for specific purposes agreed upon by the Government and dairy farmers. (This money will be advanced, interest free, for a period of at least 3 years.) We accept that additional assistance will be necessary in special cases.

I ask the Deputy Premier: Has the Government done that? Echo answers, "No."

Mr. Davies: When was that undertaking given?

Mr. TONKIN: This was an undertaking given specifically to dairy farmers in order to win their support when the Government was attempting to get into office—a boost to the rural economy; "Put us in. We will have more research. We will provide these funds so that you can have more pastures and carry bigger herds. We will carry out this research. You have got rising costs. We will find out what is causing them, with a view to reducing them. You have lowering incomes. We will do our best to increase them."

After almost 12 years in office, where is this boost to the rural economy? Where is this revolving fund of \$1,000,000, interest free, for three years, for dairy farmers?

Mr. Nalder: The money was made available.

Mr. TONKIN: It is in the limbo of forgotten things.

Mr. Nalder: It is nothing of the sort.

Mr. TONKIN: Of course, it is!

Mr. Nalder: Finance was made available to operate all the dairy farms in the south-west.

Mr. TONKIN: Was this \$1,000,000 made available in a revolving fund, interest free, for three years?

Mr. Nalder: Money was made available to extend their properties, to clear land for more properties, and to make them economic units.

Mr. TONKIN: Was this fund set up, interest free, for three years? Of course, it was not. If the Government claims it has done so much, let us have a Select Committee to see the effect of what the Government has done and whether it could, with advantage, do more, because without doubt there is a very real problem. I have yet to find the dairy farmer who considers that everything is all right with him and he has nothing to worry him.

Surely we can make some effort to ascertain what might be done to reduce costs, and I suggest that this is a very fruitful field of inquiry.

For example, an inquiry could be made into the cost of superphosphate and why the Government has not taken certain action to ensure that cash discounts are available to those persons who obtain finance through finance companies to enable them to buy superphosphate at a cash price, but who do not enjoy the benefit of the cash price. We could have an inquiry to ascertain why this advantage is not enjoyed by the producer. If we could solve that aspect alone the inquiry would be justified.

So without taking up any more time of the Assembly, I suggest that we should not accept the attitude of the Government; namely, that there is a problem which confronts all governments; that nobody can do anything about it, and so inquiries are futile. We should not accept that attitude, but we should say that this should be a comparatively costless inquiry. We should take evidence from those who have a grievance. The mere fact that we are prepared to listen to them would be an encouragement to them and would justify any time spent in listening to their problems. I feel confident that as a result of such an inquiry some worth-while suggestions would emerge which could be acted upon by the Government. However, without fail, every time that we, on this side of the House, have suggested that inquiries be made, the Government has said, "Oh no! You don't want an inquiry; we know all about it." That is what the Minister said tonight. He said, "We have all the information. We know all there is to know, so do not try to find out any more, because we can't." We on this side of the House do not accept that attitude.

We believe that no matter how much we think we might know about a subject there is always the possibility we might find out something else, and sometimes we find it out from a very unexpected source. If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I will illustrate what I have just said by referring to an incident that has remained fresh in my mind for many years.

When I was Minister for Social Services I was in the Eastern States having a look at a home for subnormal children; a place called Travencore. It was situated very close to Bryant and May's match factory. The procedure in that home was to try to educate subnormal children to fit them for some occupation they could find in Bryant and May's factory.

I was taken through the factory and shown a certain machine. The match boxes travelled down a chain, filled with matches, turned over, and were put together. The head of the home said to me,

"Do you see that little steel bar across there?" I replied, "Yes." He said, "That was put there as a result of the experience of a subnormal girl." He said, "This machine cost a lot of money and when it was installed in this factory it did not have that bar across and so we had to place the girl so that she was on hand if and when occasionally one match box came down the wrong way. Her job was merely to pick it off the chain and take it out." He went on to say, "After she had been there one day the foreman who was moving around found her standing with her finger across in a certain position and therefore no match box came down the wrong way. So all we did then was to put that little bar across."

That subnormal girl discovered something which the engineer, who made the machine, had overlooked. So in the least likely places sometimes we can find pearls of wisdom, and I suggest that even if this inquiry leads to nothing there is the possibility it may unearth some worth-while evidence that can be put to good effect, and as it would not be a costly inquiry it would be completely justified. Therefore, I hope the House will agree to the motion moved by the member for Warren.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [8.07 p.m.]: The member for Warren, in submitting this motion to the House, gave a long and detailed resume of the dairying industry, as he saw it. Despite what the Leader of the Opposition has said, the dairying industry in Western Australia is possibly the most highly organised of any rural industry and is an industry about which information on every aspect is readily available to anyone interested in making research.

The representatives of both sections of the industry—that is, the whole-milk section and the butterfat or dairy section—meet regularly in annual conference, at which the presidents of each section give long and detailed appraisals of the year's events. These reports are very comprehensive and bring anyone interested up to date on any aspect of the industry and the current events that affect it.

However, the dairying industry faces a dual problem. The first aspect of the problem is the steady increase in the internal cost structure of the economy generally, and the second is the lowering of the world commodity prices. This has taken place simultaneously with the contraction of similar marketing outlets for rural products. I think that goes without saying. If these factors affect the economy of one rural industry they will certainly affect dairying. Stated another way, it means that the producer of rural products is facing high costs of production, lower returns, and difficulty in disposing of his product, particularly on the export

market. That partly applies to those engaged in the dairying industry because, as has been mentioned by the member for Warren, this industry is in two sections: the whole-milk section and the butterfat section.

The whole-milk section is concerned with the local market. This is a well-organised, well-run, and well-led section of the industry. It faces an expanding market which is a highly desirable state of affairs. In fact, the market has been expanding at an approximate rate of 6 per cent. annually. This has permitted the Milk Board of Western Australia to license, steadily, an increasing number of milk producers to supply that market, and as this is the more lucrative form of dairying it is most desirable that licenses should be granted to as many farmers as possible.

On a number of occasions in this House I have said that the Milk Board would be wise to remove the demarcation line between the whole-milk section and the butterfat section of the dairying industry and, very largely, this has been done, although there is some definite boundary between the two sections. The whole-milk producing area has been steadily extending southward into what we know as the butterfat area, bringing with it the opportunity for dairy farmers in that part of the State to apply for a whole-milk license. The one aspect of this development which concerns me particularly is the keeping of the butterfat section of the industry ticking over until the point of time is reached when all producers can be brought within the ambit of the activities of the Milk Board, because they will be required to produce whole milk.

During the past 18 years the consumption of whole milk in this State has doubled, and I forecast that the consumption will double again in the next 10 years. This will require a greatly increased number of dairy farmers to be licensed, and it certainly offers an opportunity to those engaged in the dairy section to enter whole-milk production. I think this is a very important aspect and one which should not be overlooked.

The motion moved by the member for Warren is asking that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the dairying industry of this State in respect of—

the costs, returns and economic trends within the industry.

I think these issues are clear-cut to anyone associated with the industry. We need not have an inquiry to reveal these issues, because the information is readily available. The honourable member also seeks an inquiry into—

the effects of the sectionalised control of the industry.

At the moment I am touching on this aspect, in that we have a movement of the whole-milk producing area into the dairy section area of the State, and with the progress that is taking place, one will blend with the other.

I believe this trend is highly desirable, as I mentioned earlier. The member for Warren, in his speech, went on to refer to the probable effect of the Dairy Farm Reconstruction Scheme on the industry. In Western Australia we have had a great deal of experience with dairy farm schemes. We had the Dairy Farm Improvement Scheme which achieved a great deal for the dairying industry in the south-west. Then came the dairy farm consolidation plan which made a further substantial contribution to the welfare of a number of dairy farmers.

Following that came the latest of the schemes—the reconstruction plan. The member for Warren is seeking an inquiry into the probable effect of this scheme. It has been clearly laid down what the scheme intends to do and I do not doubt that it will achieve its objective. The following are some comments I have extracted from the remarks made by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry:—

... the Commonwealth's preparedness to make available over a period of four years a sum of up to \$25 million for use by the States in the implementation of the scheme.

Mr. Nalder: The \$25,000,000 covered all the States.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Yes. To continue with the remarks of the Minister for Primary Industry—

Of the money used by a State, 50% would be a non-repayable grant. The remaining 50% would be a loan repayable with interest at the current long-term bond rate at the time of drawing. The loan moneys would be repayable by the State over a period chosen by the State, but with a maximum of 25 years. The period could, at the option of the State, include an initial term of up to two years during which repayments of principal could be postponed. While interest would run from the date of drawing, the interest accruing during any chosen period of postponement of principal repayments could be capitalised, if so desired by the State. Again at the option of the State, repayment of loan could be made on the *credit foncier* system, or on equal instalments of principal with interest on the outstanding balance.

The funds made available to the State would be applied first for the purchase of farms bare—that is, without stock or plant; second, for the

writing-off of any fixed improvements rendered redundant on resale; and third, for such other purposes relevant to the scheme as the Commonwealth and State might agree upon.

The operation of the scheme would be defined in an agreement between the Commonwealth and the State. Within the terms of this agreement, the State would act as a principal for the implementation of the scheme. This means the State would determine the price to be paid for farms being acquired, the extent of write-down for redundant fixed improvements, and the terms and conditions applying to purchasers of land under the scheme, the State accepting any losses which might occur in the last mentioned transactions.

The State would meet its own costs of administration of the scheme. The agreement would include, in addition to the financial arrangements already mentioned, other related matters such as the objectives being sought in amalgamation and diversification; production standards for outgoing and incoming participants in the scheme; safeguards against subsequent fragmentation of enlarged properties; restrictions on sale of enlarged properties during a specified period after amalgamation in order to minimise speculation and last, but by no means least, a system of reporting on the progress of the scheme, including provision for consultations between Commonwealth and State officers as required.

I think I have mentioned sufficient to suggest what the scheme is all about and what will be its probable implications. It has not been in operation so no-one can point to what is taking place. Anyone who is associated with that part of Western Australia to which the scheme can be directed is aware that the scheme will meet the needs of the small properties, which today, because of the economic trends particularly in the rural industries, are required to become bigger and to produce more per unit. This fulfils the desire of the member for Warren to assess the probable result of the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme upon the dairying industry.

Several aspects of the dairying section of the industry are man-made problems. By that I mean that over the years the industry has become involved in schemes, such as the Commonwealth equalisation fund scheme. In my opinion currently this is reflecting to the disadvantage of the dairy farmers of Western Australia, because at present this State is falling far short of producing its requirements of dairy products, other than whole milk.

I hazard a guess that during the current year Western Australia will be paying out approximately \$8,000,000 to the Eastern States—in particular to Victoria—for imports of dairy products. In my opinion these products could and should be produced in Western Australia.

Mr. Nalder: That refers mainly to butter.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Yes. One of the obstacles in the way of production in Western Australia is the Commonwealth equalisation fund. For what it is worth I would suggest to the Minister that we explore the possibility of rebating to the States, which do not produce their full consumption requirements, their contributions to the equalisation fund. My purpose in saying that is to direct attention to the States which are producing far beyond their own requirements and are exporting the surpluses, particularly overseas, and to the fact that the price received for the products on the overseas markets is bringing down the price that is payable to the producers in Australia, particularly in Western Australia.

Mr. Nalder: Is that not done under an agreement between the Commonwealth and the States?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Yes, it is an agreement or arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States. In my view this arrangement could be altered, because as I have said it is a man-made scheme. Surely some attention should be given to the details of the scheme, and to facing up to the situation which the scheme has created. We could devise another scheme with a view to breaking down the disadvantage which the Commonwealth equalisation scheme is bringing to Western Australia. If this is done it would, on my calculations, result in \$1,000 additional income per year to the average butterfat producer in Western Australia. Such additional income would be a worth-while contribution to the producer.

The other aspect which concerns me is the payment of the Commonwealth bounty or subsidy which, at the present time, is directed to a specified quantity of butterfat—220,000 tons. There could be a closer relationship between the subsidy and the quantity of butter that is consumed in Australia. In my view the subsidy should be directed to the quantity that is produced and consumed within Australia; and the exports should not carry the bounty. If my proposal is adopted it will considerably increase the price paid to the producer, particularly to the producer in Western Australia.

I do not wish to dwell at length on this subject. I believe this is one rural industry in which the facts of the industry are very well known. As I have already

said, the sections of this industry are highly organised; the leaders of the industry meet regularly; their problems are highlighted at conferences; and proposals for the solution of them are ever being presented to the people who are able to assist in providing solutions. So I see no virtue in the motion of the member for Warren who has moved for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the dairying industry. Perhaps, if the honourable member has achieved anything at all he has provided us with this opportunity to make some comments on the industry at this point of time.

As I have said, this is an industry the details and facts of which have been well presented. There can be no need for the appointment of a Select Committee to find out the particulars which are already readily available. I oppose the motion.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [8.26 p.m.]: I want to put the record straight as far as the comments of the Leader of the Opposition in this debate are concerned. To do that it is necessary for me to trace the events relating to assistance to dairy farmers in this State. I think that as far back as 1951 I pointed out in this House the need for the introduction of a scheme.

Mr. Tonkin: What I dealt with referred to what happened from 1958 onwards.

Mr. BOVELL: I am coming to that. I think the House should be given a resume of what happened over a period of years. In 1951 or thereabouts, just before the McLarty-Watts Government went out of office, I put forward a proposal in this House which was designed to assist the dairy farmers, particularly the butterfat producers. In 1956 the then Minister for Lands and Agriculture (The Hon. E. K. Hoar) instituted a scheme which the Government of the day called the Dairy Farm Improvement Scheme. That was in 1956, and I am speaking from memory. I did not intend to speak in this debate, but in view of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition I felt it my duty to put the record straight.

Mr. Tonkin: You have not said anything which is relevant to what I have said.

Mr. BOVELL: I am coming to that. In 1955 or 1956 the then Minister for Lands and Agriculture introduced a scheme known as the Dairy Farm Improvement Scheme. It was designed to assist the butterfat producers whose operations were uneconomic. The Government of the day established two pilot areas; one at Manjimup and one at Margaret River.

That was as far as the scheme went until the Brand-Watts Government came into office in 1959. I was then appointed Minister for Lands, and it was my responsibility—and I discharged that

responsibility—to recommend to the Government the provision of financial assistance for, and the introduction of a scheme which would assist, the low-income butterfat producers in the industry. It was announced by the Premier in his 1959 policy speech that assistance would be forthcoming to low-income butterfat producers, and we as the incoming Government established the State Dairy Farm Consolidation Scheme. Through this scheme funds were made available to meet adequately the obligations of the farmers who wanted to benefit from it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That scheme fell short of the requirements, because in many instances no follow-up finance was provided.

Mr. BOVELL: This Government has fully honoured its obligations.

Mr. Tonkin: No, it has not.

Mr. BOVELL: It has.

Mr. Tonkin: Was the money made available free of interest?

Mr. BOVELL: The Government fully honoured its obligations; therefore the charges made by the Leader of the Opposition are erroneous and not in accordance with fact.

Mr. Tonkin: Why not answer the question? Was the money made available free of interest for three years, as promised?

Mr. BOVELL: The scheme was put into operation to be administered by a committee to which representatives of the dairy section of the Farmers' Union were appointed. It has been acceptable to the industry, and it has accomplished great things for the marginal farmers in the butterfat-producing areas of the State. I want to emphasise that the only real action which has been taken to assist low-income butterfat producers was taken by this Government.

The previous Government established two pilot areas which had benefited nobody by 1959. That was when the present Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, said we would get this scheme off the ground and the State dairy farm consolidation plan was established. I represent dairy farmers—the butterfat producers—and I know the assistance, as does the member for Warren—

Mr. H. D. Evans: I also know the shortcomings and the difficulties.

Mr. BOVELL: —this consolidation plan has been to the dairy farmers. Let us go a little further regarding what this Government has done. This State stood alone in accepting the Commonwealth Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme. No other State would co-operate with the Commonwealth, and we stood alone. So let the House acknowledge that this Government has, in the interests of

the low income dairy farmers, done everything possible in its power to assist them to become economic.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Is this a solution to resolving the dairying industry; by implementing this scheme?

Mr. BOVELL: It will assist.

Mr. H. D. Evans: To a very minor degree. It may not even assist at all.

Mr. BOVELL: The motion put forward by the member for Warren will accomplish nothing. The member for Wellington has clearly indicated that so much research has been carried out into the dairying industry. The knowledge of all concerned is quite adequate and this motion by the member for Warren would achieve nothing, especially as the State has agreed to participate in the proposal by the Commonwealth regarding the reconstruction scheme. One might ask: Can one logically inquire into the probable results of the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Does the Minister know what the result will be? No, he does not.

Mr. BOVELL: I hope the scheme will be as successful as this Government.

Mr. H. D. Evans: But you do not know; it could have an adverse effect on the industry.

Mr. BOVELL: This Government incorporated the State dairy farm consolidation plan, and that has been the only plan of any consequence that has been integrated in this State to assist the low income butterfat producers.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Thirteen years is not enough.

Mr. BOVELL: Therefore, Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. Mitchell), I wanted to put the record straight because of what was said by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Tonkin: You have put it straight all right.

Mr. BOVELL: The Leader of the Opposition indicated that the present Government had not carried out its undertakings.

Mr. Tonkin: Neither it has, and the Minister knows it.

Mr. BOVELL: The Government has provided funds which have been adequate for the demands and for the requirements of those who want to participate in the State dairy farm consolidation plan.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Murray) [8.33 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words on the motion submitted by the member for Warren. I support the Minister for Agriculture in his opposition to the motion. I would first of all like to refer to one or two comments made by the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke about

the dairy herds and gave the impression that they were decreasing in numbers. That is not altogether correct because I am well aware that the size of the dairy herds has increased in the south-west and many farmers are milking a greater number of cows.

Mr. Tonkin: The member for Murray is confusing me with somebody else.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Some farmers have gone out of the industry, but more cows are being handled. This is largely because of the modern machinery and the new types of milking sheds being used.

Due to the dairy improvement scheme the number of cows milked in the Denmark area was doubled. The consolidation scheme has carried on from that time and leaders in the dairying industry have praised the work done under this scheme.

Mr. Bovell: This has happened since the present Government has been in office.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The Leader of the Opposition also referred to cheaper superphosphate.

Mr. Tonkin: The member for Murray is on sound ground now; I did say something about that.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Super today is cheaper than it was a few years ago.

Mr. H. D. Evans: I was referring to the fact that the discount is not available where it should be available.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I am in agreement with a previous speaker who mentioned the Chairman of the Milk Board and said that the position of chairman should be advertised. I have previously expressed the same view because I believe this position to be so important that it should have been advertised throughout the whole of Australia. However, I want to make this very clear: the present incumbent of that office is doing a pretty good job and the producers in the industry are well satisfied with him in the short time he has held the position.

It is remarkable that only three men have held the position of Chairman of the Milk Board, Mr. Stannard, Mr. Wright, and now Mr. Frankland. They have all given very good service but on each occasion we have found that before long they run into some criticism. However, I believe that the same situation would apply to the chairman of nearly every board no matter how able he may be. The chairmen are handling the orderly marketing of a product and therefore have a difficult job to do. Naturally, there have to be regulations and restrictions and restraints in the conduct of orderly marketing. The three chairmen, in their turn, have done a great deal for the milk industry in Western Australia.

The member for Warren spoke at great length and roamed far and wide over the dairying and milk industries in this State. I would agree with a great deal of what he had to say, but he said nothing new. Everything he said is well known to all people involved in the industry, and by those who are in any way connected with it. There have been many committees of inquiry into the dairying industry in Western Australia, at all levels, carried out by university professors, economists, and farmers. Over the years all sections of the community have inquired into the dairying industry.

It seems to me to be a great pity that in many of the inquiries we heard reference to the poor dairying industry, or the poor dairy farmers. Great emphasis was placed on this aspect, but there are many people in the dairying industry who have done remarkably well. They have developed their farms, starting purely as butterfat producers. However, they have diversified their operations and are in a good position today. I know many dairy farmers who would not change places with wheat farmers or woolgrowers. The leaders in the butterfat industry and in the whole-milk industry have contributed a great deal to those industries. The leaders in the butterfat industry have become successful dairy farmers over a number of years, and they would not accept a whole-milk quota if it were presented to them. They are well satisfied with their situation, and this applies to a good many dairy farmers.

The Minister referred to the meeting of all sections of the industry held at Manjimup earlier this year. I was also present at the meeting and the matter of a single authority was raised. It brought forth quite a deal of discussion and created a great deal of interest. The president of the whole-milk section of the Farmers' Union, Mr. Eckersley, was also at the meeting and he was asked to give the views of his section on the single authority. He could not very well do that at the time and it was decided he would submit recommendations from the Farmers' Union butterfat section to the whole-milk section at the annual conference to be held at Pinjarra a little later.

That is what he did and it was decided that the submission for a single marketing authority would be referred back to the various branches of the whole-milk section of the Farmers' Union. It was decided that submission would be made and it would be discussed at the next conference of the butterfat section of the Farmers' Union, which is to be held early next year.

That decision satisfied not only the members of the association at Manjimup but also the whole-milk representatives at Pinjarra. The leaders in both sections of the industry have been working on this matter, and many of the items to which

the member for Warren referred will be, and are being, discussed with a view to getting the two industries together to discuss what can be done to merge them into a single marketing authority.

I am quite convinced there will be a single marketing authority, but it will be a milk marketing authority. The milk producers, or the milk section, will gradually take over the whole of the industry in Western Australia. It is doing that now and each year we find more and more people from the butterfat areas coming into the industry.

Those people were very pleased recently when the board decided to bring people from the Busselton and Capel areas within the boundaries of the whole-milk zone. I think it is only a matter of time when the boundaries will be extended even further. I would like to point out that the boundaries were extended mainly to give the butterfat producers in the area an incentive to stay within the industry.

There is no doubt, and I agree with the member for Warren in this, that in time we will require a far greater number of milk producers in this State. However, we must also remember that within the present boundaries a great deal more milk can be produced, and that there are many people within the industry now—and they have been within the industry for a number of years—who can produce a greater gallonage of milk for the metropolitan area if given the opportunity by an increase of quota. I have no fears for the industry in this respect.

I also consider that if the price of baby beef, or beef cattle, were to recede slightly it would be found that many more people would be milking cows and seeking quotas. The milk industry has never been a closed industry in this State; it has always been open. The nearest the industry got to being closed was five years ago when there was a fairly sharp increase in the price of milk. For two years after that price increase very few people were admitted to the industry.

However, since that time there has been a steady increase and I understand the latest number of producers to be brought into the industry is in the vicinity of 40. There will be an acceleration in the number engaged in the industry largely because of the increase in the population of the State, and the large number of migrants who are coming here. I believe the whole-milk industry can look forward to a bright future.

The price of milk in Western Australia, and in Australia for that matter, is based very largely on the costs of production. It is some five years now since there was an increase. Most people will realise that the costs of production over the last five years have mounted considerably. I know

that the industry itself has made representations for an increase in the price of milk because of the increases in costs.

In opposing the motion I, like other speakers, feel that the industry itself is well aware of the problems. It has offered many suggestions to remedy them. The leaders in the industry are working together with a view to improving the situation and I believe that they will. I cannot see that the appointment of a Select Committee comprising five or six members of Parliament would achieve anything. I do not think they would come up with any new evidence at all and, consequently, the appointment of such a committee would not contribute in any way to the industry. If I thought it would benefit people in the whole-milk and dairying industries, I would support it. However, I oppose it because I do not think it would contribute anything.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren) [8.47 p.m.]: The Minister and all other speakers from that side of the House have claimed that they are fully conversant with the problems of the industry and, therefore, no further examination of the situation is required. It beats me: if they are so conversant, why have they not made some move and taken action long before this?

The Minister very conveniently suggested that it might be regrettable if some Government action were taken at this time because it might upset current negotiations between two sections of the industry. The Minister has conveniently forgotten that the dairying industry not only embraces the whole-milk section and the butterfat section, but includes manufacturers, processors, the Milk Board and its organisation, the Department of Agriculture structure, and the Rural and Industries Bank. In fact, the appropriate Minister told us how much the Rural and Industries Bank has contributed through its specialised agencies. If all these people can be disregarded simply because a tiny part of one section only is at variance with another part, the reasoning and logic are extremely hard to follow. All these people have a point of view, an opinion, an interest, and all are concerned with what is transpiring within the dairying industry. The suggestion that the two sections could formulate a policy if left to their own devices is, to say the least, puerile.

I was rather pleased that the member for Murray mentioned the leaders of the dairying industry and referred to the president of the manufacturing section and to the president of the whole-milk section, Messrs Eckersley and Noakes respectively. They certainly are men of infinite capacity and tenacity of purpose. The industry is indeed fortunate that it has people like these and both have been on the joint committee which was set up in 1969 at the instigation of the annual conferences

of the two sections of the industry. They have represented the dairying industry on Australia-wide organisations and would be doyens in their own right. They would be leaders in the true sense of the word in the industry which they represent. The broad principles of their ideas are, to a very large measure, in concordance with each other.

I have here a letter from the president of the whole-milk section of the industry. I will chance your tolerance, Mr. Speaker, and read one sentence. It is at strong variance with the view put forward by the Minister who could find no merit whatsoever in the case presented in support of an inquiry nor could he find any justification for it. The president of the whole-milk section simply says—

I must congratulate you on your homework. You have covered the whole subject extremely well and presented it in a fair and just manner.

This was his assesment of the case for an inquiry submitted by the Opposition. He would be one of the most competent men in Western Australia to voice an opinion. He makes reference to several features and says that the issue cannot be left to the industry, because of the urgency that is involved.

I am dealing with the views of a man who has some authority in this matter, not with the views of somebody who is groping around in a sense of expediency. He points out that although all the factors are known, half a dozen reliable men could resolve many of the difficulties confronting the industry at this stage. This could obviate long discussion.

He also refers to the need for a study to be made of transportation within the dairying industry. Not one member on the other side of the House touched upon this question, but it is something which should demand immediate and close inspection. I shall make a few comments on that point a little later.

The second letter is from the president of the manufacturing section; that is, the butterfat section. He concludes with the remark—

There is an urgent need for some positive action by the Government, and if a Select Committee can bring this about we will give it every support we can.

As I have said, this comes from the president of the other section of the industry. It is certainly not in agreement with what the Minister said: that we dare not interfere at this stage because we could upset the delicate discussions that are taking place. However, both sections are obviously in agreement that some Government support, with proper legislation in due course, would be the best benefit that could be bestowed.

The broad agreement between the two sections of the industry is freely recognised. The major obstacle, as it is seen, is that it might be difficult to convince one section of the industry, which is happily positioned, that it would be to the overall benefit of the State and the industry at large to investigate still further the other side—their brethren in the butterfat section—to obtain some further benefit by a redistribution of the industry as it at present exists. It is a very human and natural obstacle but it stems from a sense of unawareness on the part of many of those people. If the matter were aired and ventilated in a full inquiry perhaps some of those people would change their opinions, as did the leaders of the butterfat section of the industry when it was fully sheeted home to them.

I would like briefly to mention several points. I consider they are salient points which are being ignored and totally disregarded in a request which is both reasonable and logical if the Government is sincere in maintaining the butterfat section of the industry, which I am coming to doubt.

Milk production in this State is somewhere near static. On the one hand milk in the liquid industry is increasing while that in the manufacturing section is declining. The State requirement is growing. It was pointed out that in 1959-60 our total imports of manufactured dairy produce amounted to \$4,000,000. The member for Wellington pointed out that it was \$7,800,000 last year. In 1976 the imports are expected to reach \$15,000,000 and in 1980, \$21,000,000. This means that in a decade's time our importation will increase threefold, and the State cannot stand this. There is every justification for producing our full requirement as well as we are able. It is the manufacturing side that is decreasing while the whole-milk side is increasing and it is the importation of manufactured dairy produce with which we are concerned.

I stated very clearly that butterfat prices have been declining. Butterfat is fetching the same as it was in 1956. I do not think any other industry can be instanced which is still sharing the same cost-price structure, which was referred to by several speakers, and which is still receiving the same returns that applied all those years ago.

Mr. Bovell: The woolgrower is recovering less.

Mr. Gayfer: What about the wool industry?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: We will not touch on the subject of wool. Other industries are different in some respects, but the position I am referring to has been going on for over 15 years. Other farming, like wool farming, has only recently been

feeling it. Many are leaving the industry and the figure of 10 per cent. which I quoted was supplied by the processing manufacturers in the Manjimup area. They said that people are leaving the industry at the rate of 10 per cent. a year. If the same trend continues the position will deteriorate even more rapidly.

Whether or not an industry can remain is a question of sheer economics. A declining throughput means inclining costs. It is as simple as that. If butterfat producers are leaving at this rate, it means that those who are left behind are faced with increasing costs and declining returns because there is no opportunity to increase the price which the farmer obtains for his article. This cannot be done, because it would not be practicable to load an increased price onto the consumer. It would simply strengthen the argument for the importation of additional substitutes and would lend strength to the arguments put forward by the manufacturers of substitutes. Therefore, it is something that cannot be achieved. An increase in return is simply out of the question. It is simply a matter of reducing costs.

This can be done because of several factors. The rationalisation of the industry, which was so carefully neglected by speakers on the other side of the House, is one of the most profitable avenues for investigation. Sometimes three trucks cover the same routes. They go past the same spurs and return for most of the year with only a portion of a load. This amounts to many thousands of dollars in the course of a year.

Mr. I. W. Manning: I do not think the honourable member should fall for that one.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Can the member for Wellington justify a truck going from Capel to Northcliffe for the sake of four cans?

Mr. I. W. Manning: If there had been merit in this it would have been done long ago.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Why not undertake an examination of the situation and have a detailed report made? The same thing occurs on journeys to Margaret River, Denmark, and Walpole. This involves thousands of miles each week. This is just one example where substantial savings could be effected.

Other avenues which bear investigation are the capitalisation of the industry, the siting of processing plants, the making available of finance, the system of bonuses, and the vicious competition between the manufacturing sections of the industry. The latter is paid for by the producer if by nobody else.

Mr. I. W. Manning: The honourable member is talking about healthy competition.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: Healthy competition, my very word, for which the producer is paying! It is certainly not to the benefit of the producer.

I also pointed out in my original submission that the cost of bottles to the dairying industry is \$140,000 a year. Perhaps we can wave that aside with a sweep of the hand as the member for Wellington seems inclined to do. However, there are two factors within the industry which indicate there is a ray of hope—some optimism—that may be extended to the butterfat producers before the situation becomes so desperate that it is not worth saving, economically speaking.

Nobody has dwelt upon the fact that this State now has a recommended quota for butter, which will not be filled. So we have a quota for butter, we have a fairly desperate situation in the industry, and we are not fostering the industry in any way. I think the production of butter for this year is expected to be about 6,100 tons, whereas our quota will be 6,500 tons. This will last, perhaps, for another year and then the Australian dairy marketing authority will review the situation and reduce the quota.

However, while we have an assured quota that our dairy farmers can strive to attain, and while we have an extension of the whole-milk industry at the rate of 6 per cent. a year, it means that, overall, there will be sufficient money in the industry to assure everyone involved of a reasonable living over a period of time, provided there is no extensive reorientation of the present situation.

One aspect which I probably did not make fully clear concerns the manufacture of yoghurt and flavoured milk—a most lucrative section of the industry. The producer receives something in the vicinity of 17c a gallon. This comes from surplus milk; quota milk at 42c a gallon is not involved in this. Many thousands of gallons of milk a week are used in the products I have mentioned and the margin of profit is most extensive.

It is from this area of production that bounties and bonuses accrue to one section—the whole-milk section—of the industry, whereas it is fairly reasonable to suggest that they should accrue to the whole of the industry and not just to this favoured section. I do not think the State can afford to lose the dairying industry, but it could readily happen. The total decline will seriously affect the State for a long time.

The dairy farmers who are now leaving the industry will be virtually lost for all time. It is a lifetime's work to build up a dairy herd, and once a person leaves the industry it is most unlikely that he will return to it. This is certainly the case with the returns as they are at the

moment, and a farmer would not have the finance to buy back a dairy herd once he is out of the industry.

So this is the situation we are facing: we have a decline in the dairying industry about which we are not doing a great deal; and this is something which will reflect adversely on the State. Our imports of dairy products will treble within the course of 10 years and that is something we cannot afford, from the sheer economic point of view if from no other.

A further point which I think was not fully realised by some of the speakers on the other side of the House is that as these dairymen leave the industry the services and facilities upon which dairymen depend will diminish still further and, ultimately, they just will not exist. That, of course, will make it even more difficult for the few remaining. In this way we have a self-perpetuating and self-generating decline.

I cannot allow the opportunity to escape without making some remarks on the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme which has been held out as the pattern, and as the ultimate in the reconstruction of all rural industries. I have some reservations about the scheme and I am not the only one. Many people in the dairying industry far more qualified than I are not completely content with the situation. The member for Wellington read out the conditions and said they were quite clear. Certainly they are clear as they appear in the copy of the transcript made available by the Minister for Primary Industry.

However, what will happen once the scheme starts? The broad principle of the scheme is that uneconomic dairy farmers will be helped to leave the industry. Their farms will be purchased by the authority set up by the State Government and the land will be disposed of as the authority sees fit. If some of the land is to be earmarked for reserves, for forests, for the diversification of farmers, or for anything else that looks like providing a suitable usage, it means that there must be a decline in milk production. Once again we have the situation of lowering the throughput and increasing the costs. Those who remain in the industry will be disadvantaged to the extent that production will be lowered. That will be the situation, and that is what the Minister and other speakers on the other side of the House claimed is not worthy of examination.

It is something that warrants very close examination because nobody knows what will happen. As the Minister said, it is a matter of "time will tell." However, if we leave it at that it will be too late to salvage anything at all from what is now a very sick industry.

As I mentioned, the Minister did not refer to any other section of the dairying industry apart from the whole-milk and the manufacturing sections. I have had discussions with the officials of two major processing plants and they are most concerned. They feel that something has to be done and that if it is not done immediately it will be too late. They are men who are vitally concerned with what is happening at the moment. They can see the future—and they do not need a crystal ball. They can see the future from the cold economics of what the industry is producing year after year and the unfortunate, frightening trend that has been displayed.

I have discussed the matter with officials, at all levels, of the Department of Agriculture and none of them is sanguine about the future of the industry. On the contrary, they are unanimous in the desire that something should be done as soon as possible.

My discussions with Rural and Industries Bank officials suggest that they do not view the future with a great deal of optimism. All the communications I have received from milk vendors, and the situation outlined by the member for Fremantle, show that the milk vendors are unanimous in their discord and concern at what is transpiring at the moment. So I feel there is ample justification for examining the situation which exists at the moment. The motion before the House requests such an examination. Well, why not? It certainly will not be as expensive as some of the examinations the Government has become prone to hold of late, as was pointed out by my leader. I think he highlighted that point very clearly. However, if this policy of *laissez-faire* is to continue I am afraid that the future of the industry is as dark as I see it.

The recommendations that such a committee could put forward could be the salvation of the dairying industry. Much play has been made on the statement that we know everything there is to know, but what recommendations have come forth as a result of this knowledge? Very few! It requires an objective and open-minded body such as a Select Committee, after hearing all the submissions that are made to it, to say, "This is what we consider should be done in the interests of the dairying industry and the State as a whole." As I see it, this is the only approach to the situation.

I cannot see that a refusal of this request is in any way defensible. If the Government is genuine in its desire to retain a dairying industry in this State it will agree to the motion which is now before the House. If it does not agree, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the Government has no interest in

the well-being of what has been a fairly important industry to Western Australia, and which still could be to an even greater extent. So I commend the motion to the House.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—21

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bertram	Mr. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moir
Mr. Cook	Mr. Norton
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Toms
Mr. Graham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Harman	Mr. Davies
Mr. Jamieson	

(Teller)

Noes—24

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Sir David Brand	Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Burt	Mr. Mensaros
Mr. Cash	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Court	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Dr. Henn	Mr. Stewart
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Young
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Williams

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ACT

Disallowance of Regulations: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 23rd September, on the following motion by Mr Cook:—

That regulations to the Agricultural Products Act, 1929-1968 as printed in the *Government Gazette* No. 82 of the 31st August, 1970, and as tabled in the House on 8th September, 1970, be and are hereby disallowed.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [9.16 p.m.]: This motion by the member for Albany seeks to disallow regulations made under the Agricultural Products Act. At the outset I think it is necessary for me to give the House information on the reasons put forward by those engaged in the industry, the Potato Marketing Board, and other interested parties, as to why these regulations were gazetted. The history of the events leading up to the amendment of the regulations stems back to the 11th meeting of the Agricultural Council held in February, 1940.

As a result of this meeting a conference of departmental officers and growers' representatives was held in Melbourne on the 21st May, 1940, to discuss potato grading regulations with a view to securing uniformity in all States. The conference did not achieve the desired objective and

the matter was not raised again until 1958. In that year—1958—a conference of State officers was held in Melbourne to discuss uniform grades for potatoes.

As a result of recommendations at this meeting, a uniform grade schedule was agreed to by the Agricultural Council and adopted in all States, except in Western Australia. Let me repeat that this was in 1958. Provision was made for a special grade which excludes potatoes above 16 oz. At this stage, No. 1 grade was similar in all States but still included potatoes of 3 oz. and over.

In 1967, following a recommendation from the Federal Potato Advisory Committee, the Standing Committee on Agriculture discussed the placing of some limit on the size of potatoes that may be sold as No. 1 grade and agreed that a range of 3 oz. to 16 oz. was desirable as the main commercial grade. It was recommended that a meeting of State officers be called to consider the grading and packing regulations for potatoes.

Prior to the meeting of State officers, which was held in Sydney on the 4th October, 1967, the views of the Western Australian Potato Marketing Board and the Potato Growers' Association of W.A. were sought. The board supported the principle of uniform grading and indicated its agreement with proposals to introduce two additional grades as follows:—

No. 1 Special Grade—limit 16 oz.

No. 1 Large Grade—minimum 16 oz.

Potato growers, however, were not unanimous, although the majority of zones was in favour of the two additional grades; that is, in Western Australia. Recommendations from the Sydney meeting of October, 1967, included a No. 1 grade—3 oz. to 16 oz.—and a No. 1 large grade—above 12 oz. At its 79th meeting the Standing Committee resolved that the recommendations be adopted.

At the request of the Western Australian Potato Marketing Board in March, 1970, an amendment of the potato grading regulations was gazetted recently to incorporate the changes referred to. These proposals were referred to the Potato Growers' Association of Western Australia which endorsed them. Subsequently, a move from the Albany zone to upset the recommendations was made at a potato growers' executive meeting, but this was rejected. The amendments were approved by Executive Council on the 15th July, 1970, and the regulations were published in the *Government Gazette* of the 31st August, 1970.

I wish to assure members there has been no confusion about the regulations by the Department of Agriculture, the Western Australian Potato Marketing Board, or the executive of the Potato Growers' Association of Western Australia—the three

groups of people who are interested in the marketing of potatoes in Western Australia.

It appears, however, that considerable confusion was caused amongst growers and merchants by a campaign against the regulations. This is evidenced by letters from merchants which refer to a 12 oz. maximum size instead of a 16 oz. size, and also by the fact that the petition signed by growers gives no indication that tubers over 16 oz. can be marketed.

In allocating quotas for delivery of potatoes, the Western Australian Potato Marketing Board requires that they may be graded so they can be channelled to Eastern States destinations and at the same time meet the standard Australian requirements. Up to 30 per cent. of local potatoes are exported. The survey conducted by the Western Australian Potato Marketing Board indicates there is a greater demand for potatoes of the proposed No. 1 grade than there is for over 16 oz. tubers. Orders for very large potatoes can well be made with the proposed No. 1 large grade.

The introduction of the proposed grades will not involve growers in a lot of additional grading. Tubers of over 16 oz. will need to be removed, along with other potatoes that do not meet the requirements. In most years the percentage of tubers over 16 oz. in weight is small.

The use of close planting techniques and the selection and treatment of seed can ensure that crops do not produce over-large tubers. The adoption of these techniques does not decrease the yield.

Mr. H. D. Evans: But it decreases the cost.

Mr. NALDER: I sought some information today as to what problems, if any, would eventuate as a result of these regulations. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I propose to exhibit on the Table of the House potatoes which are over 16 oz. These are the potatoes that will be graded out by the growers.

I expect that merchants will be doing the same thing if they are grading potatoes for sale. These large potatoes I have in my hand are supposed to be 22 oz. potatoes and while they are not grown to a great extent they are produced in some areas.

So that members might appreciate the difference between an under 3 oz. potato and the others, I have some exhibits which will illustrate the size of the potatoes that the grower must take out of his production before he can offer them for sale. This 3 oz. potato will give members some indication of the position so far as grading is concerned.

Mr. Graham: Are the small ones on the banned list?

Mr. NALDER: They are not permitted to be sold except for seed.

Mr. Graham: The housewife would go mad to get them.

Mr. NALDER: This was the decision made by the Potato Marketing Board.

Mr. Graham: What about the housewives?

Mr. NALDER: In order that I might get an indication of the position as to the possible sale of the large potatoes I asked the Potato Marketing Board the following question:—

Are potatoes over 16 oz. readily saleable?

I received the following reply:—

Potatoes over 16 oz. are readily saleable provided the quantity is a very small percentage of local production.

They cannot be used for export to Eastern States and there is a limited demand for them locally.

Potatoes sold to the Eastern States in this grade must be 12 oz. and over. The merchants there will not accept the larger potatoes on their own—they must be from 3 oz. grade to 16 oz. grade. In Western Australia, however, potatoes from 12 oz. and over make up the No. 1 grade. That is the grading the grower must make. The answer to my first question continues as follows:—

However, some institutions and fish and chip shops prefer large potatoes. A survey conducted by the W.A. Potato Marketing Board involving 68 fish and chip shops in the metropolitan area, showed that 4 per cent. of the shops, in the survey, wanted over 16 oz. tubers.

The second question that I asked the board reads—

What is the estimate of small potatoes—under 3 oz.—harvested in the year compared with large potatoes—those over 16 oz.?

The board's answer was as follows:—

In a survey of potato crops carried out in all districts by the Department of Agriculture the percentage of small—under 3 oz.—potatoes was recorded. For 76 properties included in the survey the average percentage of under 3 oz. tubers was 6.1. However, the range was from 1.1 to 26.9 per cent.

Attached to these questions is a copy of the survey which I am prepared to table with your permission, Mr. Speaker. It is Bulletin No. 3456 and is entitled *Survey of Potato Losses in the Field*. The answer to my second question continues as follows:—

In the last two years there has been an incentive for growers to increase the percentage of under 3 oz. tubers

in their crops as the size range of 1 to 3 oz. is valuable for the export seed trade to Ceylon and Mauritius. Approximately 2,400 tons of seed in this size range was exported last year.

The demand for small seed has led to closer planting and an overall reduction in the size of potatoes.

The percentage of large tubers is also influenced by seasonal conditions as well as management practices. A wide range in the percentage of over 16 oz. potatoes would be found between growers. However, it is estimated that the percentage of over 16 oz. tubers would not exceed 5 per cent.

I give this information to indicate that the decision to agree to the request of the Western Australian Potato Marketing Board and the Potato Growers' Association was not taken lightly. Some months passed before a final decision was made. As is well known, a move was made from a section of the growers in the Albany district against this proposal.

To ensure that we were not making a decision which did not have the strong support of the majority of growers, the request, as I mentioned earlier, went back to the board and the Potato Growers' Association and, as a result of the discussions that took place on the second occasion, a recommendation was pressed on the Government to make this decision.

I accept this decision as being one that was reached after a great deal of research by the Potato Marketing Board; and it must have had the support of the majority of the growers. For this reason the Government agreed to have gazetted regulations to allow potatoes to be marketed under these conditions. We are surely on very good ground in requesting that these regulations be gazetted, particularly as this was supported and recommended by the authority controlling the licensing and growing of potatoes. I might add that the growers' association also supported this recommendation.

For that reason I believe it would be very unwise for this House to disregard all the information that has been made available as a result of the representations from the industry. I feel at least the proposal should be given a trial. If over a period of a year or two years it proves to be unsuccessful, then a decision could and should be made as to whether or not it should continue in operation.

Mr. Graham: What do you think is the present attitude of the potato growers—in favour of or opposed to the new regulations?

Mr. NALDER: I believe the majority of the growers are in favour of the new regulations.

Mr. Graham: I would have thought otherwise.

Mr. NALDER: That is the opinion of the honourable member. I have obtained information from the Potato Marketing Board, and it is still of the opinion that the proposal should be adopted.

Mr. Davies: Tell us about the survey you mentioned.

Mr. NALDER: The survey was made by the Department of Agriculture, and it covered the growing of potatoes generally.

Mr. Cash: Before you resume your seat, what is the reason for not permitting the smaller potatoes to be sold? It seems everybody wants to buy them.

Mr. NALDER: At the present time there is a premium on that size of potatoes, which are used for seed. They are also sold at an increased rate in Mauritius and Ceylon. For those reasons premiums are paid to certain growers to produce that size of potato. However, a standard must be set for the size of potato that is placed on the market. Agreement has been reached in every State of the Commonwealth that no potato under 3 oz. shall be put on the market.

Mr. Graham: Notwithstanding the fact that the public want the smaller potatoes.

Mr. NALDER: That is entirely a matter for the board to decide.

Mr. Davies: Why should the board decide what the public want?

Mr. NALDER: The board is the responsible body, and this House gave it the authority.

Mr. Davies: Is the board to tell us what size potatoes we are to eat, whether or not we like the size it determines?

Mr. NALDER: This Parliament gave the board the authority for marketing potatoes.

Mr. Davies: Has the board not been given the authority by this Parliament to provide the public with what they want? Surely that is the prime concern!

Mr. NALDER: The board is in charge of these matters.

Mr. Davies: It is selling potatoes of one size; and that is all.

Mr. NALDER: I believe I have given very sound reasons why the regulations in question should be given a trial, and for those reasons I oppose the motion moved by the member for Albany.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren) [9.33 p.m.]: Whilst I cannot disagree entirely with what the Minister has said, I have grave reservations on some of the points he has raised. At the present moment the situation is that the growing of grade 1 potatoes, which are classified as those above 3 oz., is the only requirement placed on the growers, providing quality standards are met.

The regulations in question bring in two additional grades. The reason is fairly obvious. Potatoes that are surplus to requirements are exported frequently and, indeed, quite often, to Sydney. In New South Wales the Western Australian grades of potatoes do not fit in with the local grades, and as a consequence they have to be regraded at considerable cost. This lowers the return of the particular pool—and there are three pools each year. While we acknowledge that potatoes should be exported to Sydney in the correct grades, to insist that the entire crop be graded to conform—when that has not been shown to be necessary—is indeed another matter.

The proposed gradings are grade 1 comprising potatoes over 3 oz. to 16 oz., and grade 1 large comprising potatoes over 16 oz. These new gradings will bring about several results. One is that the growers feel certain the new gradings will increase their costs of growing. Admittedly, the Minister has said that small potatoes can be grown by using the proper techniques, but this involves closer planting and increases the cost per acre by quite a few dollars. Whether it be the application of closer planting or other growing techniques, the costs will be increased, just as if additional grading was involved.

If the production schedule is to be meaningful—and this is established before each pool—then the cost to the consumer will be increased. I cannot go along with any increase in the cost to the consumer, if the increase is not necessary. If the only requirement is to grade 20 per cent. of the annual potato crop—and roughly 30 per cent. from two of the pools each year is exported—but the entire crop is to be subjected to the new grading regulations, then undoubtedly the costs will be increased; and these costs will be included in the cost of production. The result is that the cost to the consumer will also be increased, and I am not prepared to go along with this if it is unnecessary.

This matter should be examined a little more closely. The growers in my area—this is fairly general, and my area is one of the main potato growing districts of the State—acknowledge there is some need for the grading of export potatoes; but there is also some need for additional compensation. To illustrate what I am saying, I would point out that 3,600 tons of specially graded potatoes were exported to Singapore. This involved the growers in a cost of about \$10 a ton to produce those potatoes, or this was the saving to the board.

The return to the pool was something in the order of \$36,000, but when that amount was distributed over the entire

pool, the growers who had made the additional production possible received a profit of about \$1 a ton. So, for all the extra work which saved the board about \$10 a ton they received a profit of \$1 a ton. This shows the injustice and the iniquity of the situation. If potatoes are to be graded and if this involves additional cost, then the growers who are responsible for the production should be compensated in some way.

I am not at all convinced that the entire potato crop should be confined to those two grades. As the position stands, where no maximum is fixed any potato which is over 3 oz. in weight—provided it is of the required quality—is deemed to be a grade 1 potato. When the merchants receive those potatoes—and 60 per cent. are sold as washed and prepacked potatoes—the large ones are graded out in the process of washing and are sold at a premium of \$30 per ton. The growers are only too happy to produce grade 1 large potatoes at \$30 per ton. The merchants are happy to do this work under the present grading system, and they are well compensated. They provide a service to those sections of the consuming public which require these potatoes. There is no impost over and above the general price.

If all this is thrown back onto the growers, then one of two things will happen. Either the growers will be asked to bear the additional cost—if the cost of production schedule is at all meaningful this will not happen; and if it can be shown that further costs are incurred then it will result in an impost on the consumer—or alternatively the existing grading could be left, and two other gradings could be brought in to make three grades in all. In that event whatever grade is required can be obtained.

If there is a call by the public for grade 1, 3 oz. plus potatoes, then the packers and the merchants involved can continue with their present business of supplying those potatoes. They can continue to wash the potatoes, extract the large ones, and make a reasonable margin.

If potatoes are required for export—and 30 per cent. of two pools is involved—they can be extracted from the current supplies of the growers, so that the growers concerned can produce the potatoes to meet the export needs.

However, there is the reservation and proviso that if there is on that 20 per cent. of the crop an impost for grading—an additional cost—then it should be fulfilled.

So at this stage, while I acknowledge the need for a regulation of this kind with regard to export potatoes, I cannot agree that there should be an unnecessary increase in the cost to the general public, and, as this regulation is designed at the

moment, this is what will occur. I do not want to oppose the regulation entirely because it is a good principle, but in its present form I cannot go along with it. I feel the motion should be withdrawn and that the Minister should re-examine the situation in this light, with the idea of establishing possibly three grades instead of the two he wants. In a matter of a couple of years the problem would resolve itself because the type of potato required would simply be the one demanded and everyone would know and there would be no danger of increasing the cost to the consumer, thus bringing disrepute upon the board, and, in general, upsetting the harmony of the present *status quo*.

I therefore ask the Minister to withdraw these regulations and have them re-examined in that light, with particular regard to the three grades instead of the two he suggests.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [9.42 p.m.]: Having been the one responsible for the introduction of the legislation which brought the Potato Marketing Board into existence, I suppose I can claim some forbearance on the part of members to enable me to present to the House a protest on behalf of a good lady who lives at Esperance. By a strange coincidence she forwarded to me by yesterday's mail a few potatoes, with a covering letter to the effect that in Esperance it is not possible to buy any potatoes other than this type. So, if you, Sir, would extend to me the same indulgence you extended to the Minister for Agriculture, I would like to display these potatoes.

Mr. Graham: We will have a green-grocer's shop soon.

Mr. TONKIN: This good lady wants to know why it is that no potato other than this type is obtainable in Esperance.

I am concerned about the angle emphasised by the member for Warren and also mentioned by the member for Albany; that is, that the regulation which we are endeavouring to have disallowed will result in an increase in cost to the consumer. That cannot be accepted unless it can be shown that the extra expenditure is justified by some advantage which will accrue in some other direction.

I agree that with regard to the export of potatoes it is desirable we should have a fixed grade in order to have some uniformity and to comply with requirements. However, I cannot see why we should take steps to exclude from the local market potatoes which apparently are acceptable in certain places. The member for Albany submitted quite a good deal of evidence to indicate that there are certain people who look for the larger potato; for example, fish shops which sell quite a number of potato chips, prefer the potato as large as

they can get it. The member for Albany quoted several letters from people who had assured him that they preferred the larger potato. So apparently there is a market. Why exclude these from sale when they will only be wasted?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Merchants get quite a profit on these.

Mr. TONKIN: Why should we have a regulation which means additional costs because of extra grading and denies the market potatoes which are readily acceptable in certain sections?

Mr. Nalder: These potatoes will be sold. They will be graded above the 16 oz.

Mr. TONKIN: They will be sold as a grade above the 16 oz., but will not the extra grading for that purpose result in an additional cost over the various grades?

Mr. Nalder: Not according to the information given to me by the board.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The growers are adamant that it will.

Mr. Nalder: The growers are represented on the board as is also the growers' association.

Mr. TONKIN: It would appear that the regulation involves additional grading, which means additional work, and I cannot see it otherwise. That will result in additional cost. That is how it appears to me, but if that is not so I have come to the wrong conclusion. I cannot see there is any real necessity to have this limitation and extra grading for local consumption. I do agree that with regard to export potatoes it is desirable to comply and have uniformity, but I think it ought to be limited to that.

The member for Warren made a very good suggestion; that is, that the Government should agree to withdraw the regulations. We do not want to press this motion, but I think the member for Albany made out a good case. He said firstly that there was a good deal of confusion, which the Minister has confirmed.

Mr. Nalder: Why not agree to give this a trial run and see?

Mr. TONKIN: If we put it into operation we get the additional expense; and for how long will the trial run operate?

Mr. Nalder: If it does not prove successful, the growers will quickly indicate that is the position.

Mr. TONKIN: In the meantime the cost to the consumer will have been increased. I believe it would be far better to withdraw the regulations and then allow the situation to settle down in order that we might gain a better understanding. The regulations should be further examined together with their possible effects. If subsequently it is felt they are absolutely necessary, they could be reintroduced. As matters stand I support the motion.

MR. JONES (Collie) [9.48 p.m.]: The Minister, when replying to the submissions by the member for Albany, indicated that in his opinion, following the investigation he had carried out, no confusion existed. I would like to put forward the views of the Donnybrook zone which represents some 10 per cent. of the growers in Western Australia, because they, too, are not happy with the new regulations. If we have a look at the position we will find that, in the main, confusion does exist.

Mr. Nalder: When did that zone change its mind, because I understood—

Mr. JONES: I was approached by the zone's secretary, who lives in my electorate. He submitted the views of the zone to me and asked me to make them known in Parliament, and this is precisely what I am doing.

Returning to my original point, it appears to me there is some confusion, because firstly the member for Warren has indicated that the growers in his district—that is, those in the Manjimup-Pemberton zone—are not certain that these regulations will not increase costs. Those people represent some 20 per cent. of all growers and they are of the firm opinion that increased costs will result. If we consider the views of the Albany-Denmark zone, as indicated by the member for Albany, we find that they too are dissatisfied, and they represent another 20 per cent. of the growers. The Donnybrook zone represents a further 10 per cent. of the growers so we have 50 per cent. who are not happy and who are requesting a re-examination of the proposals.

We have not heard the views of the Marybrook section or of those at Margaret River, Benger, and other smaller sections in Western Australia. However, it is quite apparent that the Donnybrook zone is firmly of the opinion held by those whose views were submitted by the member for Warren. They are not at all happy and so I consider that a state of confusion does exist and that the matter is worthy of re-examination.

There may be some merit in the suggestion put forward by the member for Warren, but I do not intend to traverse what has already been said in this House. At least 50 per cent. of the growers of potatoes in Western Australia are not happy with the changes that are contemplated.

Mr. Nalder: That is not the information given to me by the Potato Growers Association.

Mr. JONES: That is the position portrayed to me and other members on this side of the House. I have a letter from the Donnybrook zone secretary dated the 22nd

August, 1970. A paragraph from the letter reads as follows:—

The motion of the last meeting regarding the 16 oz. maximum size be recinded in light of further evidence being forwarded by the Albany Zone and Merchants.

That is part of a motion passed at a quarterly meeting held on the 21st August. I think it will be agreed that there is confusion. The Minister indicated that no confusion existed, but I have another motion which was moved and passed by the Manjimup zone committee. It is dated the 2nd September, 1970, and part of the motion reads as follows:—

In the event of Legislation being passed adopting 16 oz. maximum Grade of 1 tuber. The Board be requested to consider increasing the Wholesale price of Potatoes to compensate Growers for the increased costs incurred in additional Grading.

These are not my views; these are the views of the growers who have had experience in the industry. I also have a similar opinion expressed by the Pemberton zone committee which is dated the 1st September, 1970. Part of that motion reads as follows:—

That this Zone considers that because of the New Grading Regulations that a New Price Structure be drawn up by The Board because of the extra cost of Production.

That is quite clear and has to be believed by members. I was first of all approached by the secretary of the Donnybrook zone asking me to express the views of that zone in this Parliament. I have correspondence from the Manjimup and the Pemberton zones indicating opposition to the regulations.

We also have received submissions from the member for Albany indicating the feeling of the growers in his area. It will be seen that in three areas some 50 per cent. of the potato growers of Western Australia are represented. I do not know the views of other growers, and I do not know the attitude of the Mary Brook growers.

The Donnybrook zone growers approached me and asked me to make quite clear their viewpoint. I was asked to bring that viewpoint to the notice of the Minister in view of the circumstances and because of the confusion which obviously exists in the minds of 50 per cent. of the potato growers in Western Australia. Because of that confusion the Government should have another look at the proposed changes.

MR. MITCHELL (Stirling) [9.53 p.m.]: I did not intend to intervene in this debate, but I want to correct some statements which have been made. There seems to be more confusion in the minds of members than there is in the minds of the potato growers. The member for

Collie just stated that 20 per cent. of the growers are in the area of the member for Albany. I would say that one or two growers are living in the Albany area, but all the potato growers who are living in the Albany area are growing potatoes in my area. The potato-growing district of the Albany region is in the Stirling electorate.

To put the record straight, a representative of the Albany branch of the Potato Growers Association approached me on this matter a long time ago. I did quite a large amount of work by way of interviews, and I arranged with the representative to present the petition which was sent to the Minister for Agriculture.

At that stage I was told that if they wanted anything further they would come to me. The next I heard about the matter was the member for Albany moving for the disallowance of the regulations. I have no quarrel with the move by the growers; they were under the impression they would get more from the member for Albany than they would get from me. That is their business. However, I had done some work and I thought I was making some progress.

The situation, as I see it, is the member of the Potato Growers Association representing the Albany area was the only one opposed to the regulations when they were first brought before the association. Because he was opposed to them he took action to try to get other growers to co-operate with him. The motion was re-submitted to the Potato Growers Association suggesting that the first motion be rescinded, and one other growers' representative supported the member for the Albany area. However, I have been told that, at any time, only two representatives out of nine voted in favour of rescinding or opposing the regulations. I believe that if there is a seven to two majority in favour there cannot be much wrong with the regulations.

The main point made by the Albany representative was that he had the signatures of 380 growers opposing the regulations. However, it has been reported to me by various officials that the suggestion put to the growers was that potatoes over 16 oz. would not be saleable. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that potatoes over 16 oz. would not be saleable, and it was because of that the growers signed the petition. I am not sure if that is right, but that is what has been reported to me.

The situation as I see it is that the people who require large potatoes have been getting them, but the merchants have been grading them out of the 3 oz. to 16 oz., and the 16 oz. and upwards potatoes. They have supplied the larger

potatoes to the fish shops, hotels, and other establishments which required them. However, under the new regulations there will be a grade of potatoes available for that particular trade, and the people who require the mixed grades will purchase the 3 oz. to 16 oz. potatoes.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Yes, but it will mean an increase in costs.

Mr. MITCHELL: Whilst the growers have made the suggestion that the new grade will be available at a cost, I cannot be convinced that the merchants have been grading the larger potatoes for nothing. The growers might have thought that the merchants were grading them for nothing.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The consumers will have to pay more for the grading.

Mr. MITCHELL: No potatoes would have been supplied without a charge being made to somebody. Irrespective of that fact, the regulations cannot be as bad as the member for Albany wishes us to believe. Otherwise, more representations from the growers would have been passed on to us. As I see the situation, only two representatives out of nine on the growers association opposed the regulations. Two out of nine is not a sufficient number to warrant a motion being brought to this House to disallow regulations which have been agreed to by a three to one majority of the representatives of the Potato Growers Association. I know a number of letters have been received from the merchants saying that they do not want the regulations.

Mr. Jones: I have quoted motions.

Mr. MITCHELL: However, letters have been written to the Potato Marketing Board stating that the growers are quite happy with the regrading because it will simplify the position as far as they are concerned. I have been requested by the representatives of the Albany area to oppose this motion. I do not believe it can be in the interests of the potato growing industry to support the motion for the disallowance of the regulations in view of the fact that the majority of the representatives on the Potato Growers Association agree with the regulations. I oppose the motion.

MR. COOK (Albany) [9.59 p.m.]: I do not propose to deal at length with the reply to the debate on this motion because it is quite clear from what members on this side of the House have said that we were fully justified in bringing the motion before the House. Confusion does exist in the industry and I believe it is incumbent on the Government to disallow the regulations.

The member for Stirling was simply endeavouring to crawl out of his responsibilities to his electors and his speech amounted to nothing more than that.

Mr. Mitchell: The member for Albany said that they were his electors.

Mr. COOK: The member for Stirling said I had three in my electorate. I agree with this. However, he was simply trying to get out of his responsibilities to his electorate.

Mr. Nalder: The member for Albany will not get any credit for that statement.

Mr. COOK: The Minister should have justified the introduction of the regulations by proving to this House that there was no confusion or dissension amongst growers. He has not done this. In any orderly marketing system it is important that producers be given the opportunity to examine fully any alterations proposed to be made to that system. In this case they are confused and there is a considerable amount of dissension within the industry. This has been shown quite conclusively by speakers on this side of the House.

I shall deal specifically with a couple of points made by the Minister. He tried to show something which has been attempted in the past by various groups; namely, that the growers from the Albany-Denmark zone had misled other growers into signing a petition. Let me quote regulation 2 (b) which was printed in the *Government Gazette*. It reads—

by substituting for the definition "Grade 1" in subregulation (2) a definition as follows:—

"Grade 1" shall mean sound potatoes of similar varietal characteristics, suitable for export, weighing not less than 3 oz. nor more than 16 oz. each, mature and reasonably free from dirt . . .

I emphasise that grade 1 potatoes must not weigh more than 16 oz. each. The petition of the growers begins—

We the undersigned strongly object to the introduction of the new grading regulations regarding the maximum size of No. 1 grade to 16 oz's.

This is perfectly correct. The size of grade 1 potatoes has been restricted to 16 oz. I dispute that any misleading statements have been made in this regard.

Again, the Minister brought up a survey which was undertaken by the Potato Marketing Board. I have already mentioned my attitude towards this survey. My comments are to be found on page 922 of *Hansard* No. 8 when I moved the motion. I said—

I have already mentioned the survey of the fish and chip shops. It must be remembered that the board carried out the survey, and the board was in favour of the regulations.

The Minister did not tell us who carried out the survey on behalf of the board. What sort of questions did they ask the fish and chip shop owners? Were they leading questions? Did they put words into their mouths? If we bear in mind that the board is in favour of the regulations, surely we must doubt the validity of the claim that this is a substantial argument in favour of the regulations.

The board carried out a survey and claimed that fish and chip shops only required a small percentage of large potatoes. This is quite contrary to the opinions of merchants who, surely, are in the best position to know what their customers want. The merchants say that 16 oz. potatoes are in great demand by fish and chip shops and other institutions, so much so that the purchasers are willing to pay merchants extra to have the big potatoes graded out. This is one of the growers' arguments. They say that they are happy to grade them out for export, but why should they grade them out for the local market at extra cost when they are already being graded out by merchants? The institutions are quite happy to pay extra for the service.

The Minister mentioned the adoption of close planting and fertiliser control. This only works to a degree. For example, one cannot control the weather. Whether growers close-plant or regrade in the sheds, it will represent an increased cost to them. Motions received from two zones I represent indicate that growers will call for an increased price for the product because of the costs which will flow to them as the result of these regulations. This indicates that the costs will be passed on to the consumer.

The Minister said that we should try these regulations. I do not think we should try them at all. The producers are the ones who will bear the costs and the inconvenience of this trial. Once again, it is the producer who will have the responsibility to regrade, who will be inconvenienced, and who will have additional costs imposed on him.

When I stood up I said that I did not propose to deal with the subject at length because submissions made by other members on this side of the House adequately cover the situation. They show that there is confusion and dissension amongst growers. The Minister has not shown that there is no such confusion and dissension and for that reason I commend the motion which is before the House.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—21

Mr. Bateman
Mr. Bertram
Mr. Brady
Mr. Burke
Mr. Cook
Mr. H. D. Evans
Mr. T. D. Evans
Mr. Fletcher
Mr. Graham
Mr. Harman
Mr. Jamieson

Mr. Jones
Mr. May
Mr. McIver
Mr. Moir
Mr. Norton
Mr. Sewell
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Toms
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Davies

(Teller)

Noes—25

Mr. Bovell
Sir David Brand
Mr. Burt
Mr. Cash
Mr. Court
Mr. Craig
Mr. Dunn
Mr. Gayfer
Mr. Grayden
Dr. Henn
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Kitney
Mr. Lewis

Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Mensaros
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Nalder
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Ridge
Mr. Runciman
Mr. Stewart
Mr. Young
Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes
Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bickerton

Noes
Mr. Rushton
Mr. Williams

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 15th October, 1970

The SPEAKER (Mr. Guthrie) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (24): ON NOTICE

1. APPRENTICES

Building Trades

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Labour:

What was the number of persons apprenticed in each of the building trades respectively for each year from 1961 to 1969 respectively?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

The numbers of persons apprenticed in the various building trades for the years specified are indicated in the attached table.

BUS SERVICE

North Dianella

Mr. CASH, to the Minister for Transport:

Can he advise what action has been taken by the Metropolitan Transport Trust following my suggestion for additional bus facilities in the North Dianella area?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

A proposal for the extension of route No. 53 is currently under examination by the Perth Shire Council.

3. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Rockingham Area

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

Will he advise the House of his department's intentions and progress towards attracting and establishing manufacturing and assembling industries in the Rockingham area which would provide extensive employment opportunities for every section of the work force?

Mr. COURT replied:

The original plan for development of the Kwinana industrial area was to attract some basic heavy industries around which it was hoped would grow a network of smaller ancillary and associated industries.

At the time, 7,000 acres were set aside and establishment of industry was encouraged by the provision of services such as shipping facilities, railways, roads, utilities and housing estates.

In addition to the major plants such as refineries for oil, alumina and nickel, fertiliser manufacture, iron and steel production, there have been established numerous smaller plants such as Stanton Pipes, Westralian Wire Works, Transfields, E.P.T., N.B. Love Starches, C.I.G., Rose and Roedel, and Chemical Industries (Kwinana), etc.

Dates	Trades										Total
	Brick-laying	Stone Masonry	Carpentry and Joinery	Plumbing	Plastering, Solid	Plastering, Fibrous	Painting	Sign-writing	Lead Burning	Glazing	
As at											
30/6/61	36	1	435	212	39	2	189	15	25	954
30/6/62	32	1	455	231	46	2	175	15	22	979
30/6/63	49	1	500	242	41	2	172	18	27	1,052
30/6/64	54	3	559	281	46	2	220	21	1	37	1,223
30/6/65	72	2	659	320	59	2	254	23	1	40	1,432
30/6/66	86	2	686	327	61	1	267	23	1	38	1,492
30/6/67	85	4	716	377	53	4	290	20	1	36	1,576
30/6/68	90	4	792	391	66	18	266	25	2	40	1,684
30/6/69	110	4	816	468	66	22	255	23	1	48	1,813